Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-067
Monday
10 April 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-067 *10 April 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Reaction to Gorbachev Reactor Initiative 1
Bush Reserves Comment *[TASS]* 1
State Calls it 'No Step at All' *[TASS]* 1
Bush, State Department Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 9 Apr]* 3
U.S. Reactor Construction Noted *[TASS]* 3
Tactical Nuclear Arms 'Roadblock' to Safer Europe *[Kornilov on TASS]* 4
'Parity' Defined as 'Sufficiency' of Defense *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 13]* 5

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Nuclear-Powered Submarine Sinks Off Norway Coast 6
TASS Reports Sinking, Loss of Life 6
Party, Government Express Condolences *[TASS]* 6
Yazov Comments *[TASS]* 6
Gorbachev Informs Thatcher, Bush *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION 8 Apr]* 6
Radiation Leaks 'Ruled Out' *[TASS]* 7
Tests Reveal No Radiation *[TASS]* 7
Rescue Operations Detailed *[TASS]* 7
Submarine Sinking Reported by Domestic Press, TV 8
Yazov's Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 8
42 Dead, 27 Survive *[IZVESTIYA 10 Apr]* 8
'Military Review' Describes Incident *[Moscow TV]* 8
Absence of 'Fuller' News Decried *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 9
Gremitskiy Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 7 Apr 9
Shamir, Mubarak U.S. Visit Noted *[TASS]* 9
Afghanistan Situation Updated *[TASS]* 9
Cuba, UK Visits Cited *[TASS]* 10

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Baker's 10-11 May Moscow Visit Announced *[TASS]* 11
U.S. To Close Afghan Embassy in Washington *[TASS]* 11
U.S. Motives in Mideast Consultations Questioned *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Apr]* 11
Bush, Shamir Talks 'Aggravate' Palestinian Problem *[TASS]* 12
Results of Bush Foreign Policy Review Revealed *[TASS]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sihanouk, Hun Sen To Meet 2, 3 May in Jakarta *[Moscow International]* 13
'Opportune' Joint Indochina Statement Welcomed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Apr]* 13
SRV's Nguyen Co Thach Interviewed on Cambodia *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 14
Dismantling of Subic, Cam Ranh Bases Sought *[Moscow International]* 15
Australian Communists Visit USSR 26 Mar-4 Apr *[PRAVDA 6 Apr]* 16

Near East & South Asia

'Propaganda' on Su-24 Sales to Libya Decried *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 17
Gerasimov Urges U.S. Not To Miss Mideast Chance
[Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST 7 Apr] 17
Shevardnadze, Bhutto Envoy Discuss Afghanistan *[TASS]* 17

Central Asian Republics Delegation in Kabul *[TASS]* 18
All Main Roads to Jalalabad Said Cut Off *[Moscow TV]* 18
Afghan Rebel Attacks in Khowst, Ghazni, Sarowbi *[TASS]* 18
7,000 Mujahidin Said Killed Since 6 Mar *[Moscow Radio]* 19
Afghan Rebels Sell Weapons to Sikh Extremists *[TASS]* 19
Problems Facing UN in Afghanistan Viewed *[PRAVDA 5 Apr]* 19
Commentator Hopes for U.S. Withdrawal From Gulf *[Vasiliyev on Moscow Internaitonal]* 21
U.S. Uses Gulf War as Pretext for Navy Presence *[Batev on Moscow International]* 22
Montazeri Resignation Reveals New 'Instability' *[Krasnov on Moscow International]* 22
Fundamentalist Role in Iran Power Struggle Noted *[Moscow Radio Peace and Progress]* 23
Procurator General Meets PDRY Counterpart *[Moscow TV]* 24

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola's Dos Santos, Adamishin Discuss Namibia *[TASS]* 24
'Group Interests' Must Not Block Namibia Peace *[IZVESTIYA 6 Apr]* 24

East Europe

Shevardnadze Visit to GDR Postponed Until 'Later' *[Moscow Radio]* 25
Soviet-GDR Military Exercises To Begin 15 Apr *[TASS]* 25
GDR Delegations Visit for 'Inter-Party' Contacts 25
Razumovskiy Receives Party Officials *[Moscow Radio]* 25
Technological Group Tours Enterprises *[PRAVDA 31 Mar]* 25

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Britain 26
Gorbachev's 6-7 Apr Meetings Viewed *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 26
Gorbachev Meets British CP Leaders *[TASS]* 27
Gorbachev Meets Business Leaders *[Moscow TV]* 27
Gorbachev on 'Common European Home' *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 27
Gorbachev Talks With Londoners *[Moscow TV]* 28
Officials at Gorbachev Lunch With Queen *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 28
Thatcher Guildhall Speech Reported *[PRAVDA 8 Apr]* 28
Correction to Gorbachev Guildhall Speech 30
Thatcher Speech at Heathrow Send-off *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Gorbachev Speech at Heathrow Send-off *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Gorbachev Returns to Moscow *[TASS]* 31
Thatcher-Gorbachev Talks View Arms, U.S.-UK Ties *[IZVESTIYA 9 Apr]* 31
Gerasimov Meets Press on Gorbachev UK Visit *[Moscow TV]* 32
'Pessimists' on Soviet-UK Ties Rebutted *[IZVESTIYA 9 Apr]* 33
Deputy Premier Silayev Visits W. Germany 34
Meets Kohl in Bonn *[Moscow Radio]* 34
Visits Engels Museum, Meets Rau *[TASS]* 34
French Defense Minister Continues USSR Visit 34
Addresses Moscow News Conference *[Moscow TV]* 34
Visits Murmansk, Severomorsk *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Apr]* 35
Leaves Volgograd for France *[TASS]* 35
Visit Sign of 'Opening' in Ties *[Mikhaylov on Moscow International]* 35

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S Citizen Arrested in Panama for 'Espionage' *[TASS]* 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Georgian Mass Rallies Provoke Violence, Confrontation 38
Patiashvili Warns Against 'Discord' *[TASS]* 38

4th Day of Unrest in Tbilisi *[TASS]* 38
Tanks Meet 'Thousands' of Protesters *[AFP]* 39
16 Reported Killed *[Tokyo KYODO]* 39
Death Toll 'Could Be Higher' *[AFP]* 39
IZVESTIYA Reports on Situation *[9 Apr]* 40
Rallies, Countermeasures Described *[PRAVDA 10 Apr]* 41
Activists Report 30-50 Dead *[Hamburg DPA]* 41
Foreign Journalists Banned From Georgia *[AFP]* 42
Further Gunfire Heard 10 Apr *[AFP]* 42
Leadership Bodies Extend Condolences *[PRAVDA 10 Apr]* 42
Georgian Party Bureau Debates Abkhaz Situation *[ZARYA VOSTOKA 27 Mar]* 42
PRAVDA Reports Abkhazia Leadership Change *[7 Apr]* 43
Soviet Supreme Court Discusses Decree on Rallies *[TASS]* 43
Supreme Soviet Changes Anti-State Agitation Law *[TASS]* 43
Supreme Soviet Adopts Decree on Land Leasing *[TASS]* 44
Leasing Decree To Be Published *[Moscow TV]* 44
Second Round of People's Deputy Elections Begins 44
Elections Set for 9 Apr *[TASS]* 44
Voters Urged To Turn Out *[PRAVDA 9 Apr]* 45
Polls 'Opened Early' 9 Apr *[TASS]* 45
Medvedev, Others Elected Deputies *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Moscow District Elections Reported *[TASS]* 46
Losing Kraykom Secretary Views Poll Lessons *[IZVESTIYA 7 Apr]* 47
Russian Republic Presidium Views Election Outcome *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 7 Apr]* 49
Yeltsin Car Crash Rumors Denied by Assistant *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 51
KGB Aids in Preventing Baku Hijack Attempt *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Apr]* 51
Belorussian Heads Working Group on Republics *[Moscow Radio]* 52
Norilsk Miners End Underground Sit-In *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Apr]* 53
Moscow Police Disarm Mental Patient, Defuse Bomb *[IZVESTIYA 8 Apr]* 53
Earthquake Registered in Soviet Far East *[TASS]* 54
Armenian Earthquake Commission Meets 1 April *[PRAVDA 2 Apr]* 54
Shortcomings in Leninakan Construction, Plans Noted *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 55
Earthquake Commission Sets Up Permanent Teams *[Yerevan Radio]* 55
Armenian Construction Officials Reprimanded *[Yerevan Radio]* 56
Yerevan Commandant on 6 Apr Curfew Violations *[Yerevan Radio]* 56
7 Apr Yerevan Curfew Violations *[Yerevan Radio]* 56
8 Apr Curfew Violations *[Yerevan Radio]* 56
Baku Commandant on 5 Apr Curfew Violations *[Baku Radio]* 56
Article on NKAO Refugees, Crime Criticized *[Yerevan Radio]* 57
Workers Urged To Assist Progress of Restructuring *[PRAVDA 4 Apr]* 57
Consumers Cooperative Congress Analyzed *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 30 Mar]* 58
'Strong Center, Strong Republics' Concept Viewed *[PRAVDA 23 Mar]* 61
'Flexible' National-Territorial Structure Urged *[PRAVDA 27 Mar]* 65
Lithuanian 'Freedom League' Member Interviewed *[KOMJAUNIMO TIESA 2 Feb]* 67
Hunger Strike Fuels Estonian Ethnic Strife *[TRUD 30 Mar]* 70
Belorussian First Secretary Addresses Afghan Vets *[SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA 5 Feb]* 72
Health Official on Chernovtsy Thallium Poisoning *[MOSCOW NEWS 26 Mar]* 74
Bykovnya Grave Site Confirmed To Hold Purge Victims *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 5 Apr]* 75
Gdlyan's Conduct of Churbanov Case Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 2 Apr]* 76

Economic

Gostev Views Government Finance Plan *[TRUD 2 Apr]* 78
Editor of New Foreign Trade Bulletin Interviewed *[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY No 13]* 79
Gradual Introduction of Market Prices Urged
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 30 Mar] 80
Readers on Production Property Ownership *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 25 Mar]* 81

Agricultural

Government Creates New Agricultural Commission *[TASS]* 84

Agriculture Conference Held in Brest 6-7 Apr 84
Ligachev Delivers Report *[PRAVDA 7 Apr]* 84
Ligachev, Baklanov Visit Farms *[Moscow TV]* 87

Scientific

Activities of Crew on 'Mir' Complex Outlined 87
Maintenance Work To Be Done *[Moscow Radio]* 87
Experiments Conducted *[TASS]* 88

Military

Events Relating to Air Defense Troops Day 88
Yazov Marks Air Defense Troops Day *[Moscow Radio]* 88
Air Defense Deputy Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 88
Antiaircraft Complex Visited *[Moscow TV]* 91
Moscow Military District To Hold Exercises *[TASS]* 91

U.S. Reaction to Gorbachev Reactor Initiative

Bush Reserves Comment

LD0804132189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1935 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] [Washington] 7 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Nikolay Turkatenko reports:

The mass media here have widely reported Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to London. Particular attention has been given to the information given by the Soviet leader in his speech in London's Guildhall to the effect that the Soviet Union has taken another large step toward ceasing production of fissionable weapon materials, having already decided this year to cease the production of high concentrate uranium for military purposes, and next year to close another two reactors for the production of weapons-grade plutonium in addition to the reactor of this type already closed.

During President George Bush's press conference, which took place in the White House on Friday and which was devoted to the measures taken by the administration to fight the catastrophic consequences of the oil spill off the coast of Alaska, Bush was asked to comment on the information given by Mikhail Gorbachev.

The President was asked: Do you consider this Soviet decision a big step forward toward a reduction of nuclear weapons?

"I have not yet seen an analysis of this decision," Bush answered, "and for this reason, frankly speaking, I cannot speak about its significance with any knowledge of the matter."

Overall, the President said, we will react to everything when we are ready, when we have completed the process of thoroughly assessing U.S. strategy, which is now occurring.

Eugene Carroll, retired admiral and one of the leaders of the Washington Center of Defense Information [CDI], evaluated the Soviet decision as a step in the right direction. If the United States were to take the same step, and if both sides were to cease nuclear tests as soon as possible, then this would lead to the end of accumulating nuclear arsenals, and would consequently aid the success of talks on curbing the nuclear arms race and also—something which is very important as well—the spread of nuclear weapons in the world. Simultaneously, the CDI representative expressed the fear that influential U.S. circles would declare the Soviet decision on halting the production of weapons grade plutonium "just another trick," as they declared the Soviet moratorium on conducting nuclear tests which lasted for nearly 2 years a "trick " at the time. After all the United States did not follow the example of the USSR then. It must be said that such fears are not born on empty ground.

Many observers here have, from the first days of the present administration, turned their attention to the activity of the U.S. circles which would like to abate the pace of positive developments in Soviet-U.S. relations, which was established in the last years of the Ronald Reagan administration. Alexander Yanow, a professor at New York University, describes these circles as adherents of the "paradigm of rivalry," pointing out that they still enjoy considerable influence in the country. He says that they would like to break the tendency toward a normalization of Soviet-U.S. relations with the United States in the forseeable future regarding the Soviet Union as an "enemy," and in no circumstances ceasing the accumulation and improvement of its nuclear arsenals. It follows from this that the prospects for concluding a treaty on a radical reduction of strategic weapons are hardly likely to make the adherents of this "paradigm" happy.

To what extent does this approach influence the inhabitants of the Washington "corridors of power?" This question found special topicality here in connection with the pronouncements of William Webster, director of the CIA, which were published on Friday. Without waiting for the completion of an analysis of U.S. strategy mentioned by Bush, including its position on talks on strategic weapons, which are now on hold because of the United States, he placed in doubt—if not directly, then indirectly—in an interview with U.S. newspapers, the desirability for the United States of working out an effective agreement on the radical reduction of nuclear weapons. Realization of such an agreement would naturally demand the creation of a ramified system of reciprocal monitoring and inspection, as experience has shown with the successful elaboration of the treaty on intermediate- and short-range missiles. In Webster's opinion, as the THE WASHINGTON POST reports in its account of the interview, the Soviet proposals for measures on the comprehensive monitoring of the fulfilment of the agreement by each side on reducing strategic weapons are "hard to carry out and even conceal hidden dangers" for the United States. It is well-known," THE WASHINGTON POST writes, "that the CIA, together with a number of other U.S. departments, is coming out against the Soviet proposals on inspection, however Webster's pronouncements were a rare public evaluation."

State Calls it 'No Step at All'

LD0804101689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0003 GMT 8 Apr 89

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polyakovskiy]

[Text] Washington, 8 Apr (TASS)—The main topic of the latest briefing at the U.S. State Department on Friday was the announcement by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, that the Soviet Union has decided to cease production of

highly enriched uranium for military purposes in the current year and plans in this connection to close two industrial reactors for the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

Asked to comment on this step, Richard Boucher, a State Department official spokesman, leafing through a file containing answers to possible questions from reporters which had been prepared in advance, read the following statement: "The measures announced by General Secretary Gorbachev leave the Soviet Union with a significant potential for the production of nuclear materials. In fact, these measures do not impose any restrictions on their programs in the sphere of nuclear weaponry. They should not distract attention from the truly essential issue of reducing each side's level of nuclear weaponry through negotiations."

This stance by the U.S. Administration prompted bewilderment in the U.S. foreign policy department's briefing room.

"Don't you find anything positive in it?", the State Department spokesman was asked. "Doesn't the United States see anything positive in the gradual reduction of Soviet forces? They've already taken several steps to reduce their arsenals, but your reaction consists just of saying that there is still something there. Don't you like the speed and the direction?"

The ensuing dialogue between R. Boucher and the U.S. reporters deserves to be quoted virtually in full.

"I think you're making the wrong conclusion," Boucher replied.

"Okay, why?"

"The statement (by the U.S. State Department) says that General Secretary Gorbachev's announcements do not impose any restrictions on Soviet programs in the sphere of nuclear weaponry. Therefore, the assumption that some kind of gradual reduction of Soviet nuclear forces is going on, it seems, does not correspond to reality."

"But why? Why?"

"Is it a step in the right or the wrong direction?", another reporter interrupted. "If they built two new reactors we would probably condemn them for increasing their potential. Now they are planning to close down two reactors. Isn't that a step in the right direction?"

"In fact, this is no step at all, because it does not introduce any real changes into the Soviet nuclear production capabilities."

"Why is it not a step?"

"As far as I understand, two reactors, whose purpose was specifically to produce materials for nuclear weapons programs, are being closed. The Soviet Union still has a number of reactors, both military and civilian, producing materials which can be used for the same purposes."

"Can you cite any facts?"

"I do not possess any figures, but the Soviet Union has a vast nuclear program, both civilian and military."

"Do they have other reactors producing materials which are used or can be used for military purposes? Do they have other specifically military reactors? Are these only a proportion of them? And are there any other reactors, which can be adapted for these purposes?"

"I do not have a precise answer and I am not at all confident that this question is to the point. Evidently, if they have other reactors which can be used, and if they will feel the need to use them, they will do so."

"No, this question is to the point," the reporter who asked the question insisted, "because from reports on Gorbachev's speech it follows that these are the last two reactors capable or, more correctly, being used for the production of such material. Do you want to say that these are not the last two?"

"I cannot say precisely whether these two reactors being used at the present time are the last. What I am saying is that that is not at issue. It is not a matter of making statements. The point is that one should seriously get down to work, to arms control, to limiting the nuclear weapons of both sides."

"Richard, let me ask you, is the United States ready to resume talks at the present time? At the present time, as far as I know, the USSR has offered to resume talks, but the United States has said: not now," one of the reporters known to Boucher said.

"We are ready to resume talks. But we have not yet fixed the time," Boucher tried to counter unconvincingly.

"Do you have any other comment in connection with Gorbachev's speech? After all, he stated his readiness to study the questions you spoke about, about making progress toward nuclear disarmament. Can you say anything in this connection?"

"No," the State Department spokesman answered.

"All this is strange, Richard. The Soviet Union is closing down two nuclear reactors, and we are saying that all this is smoke...."

There is nothing to add to this remark. Indeed, "all this is strange, Richard."

Bush, State Department Criticized

PM0904141589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 5

[A. Shalnev article under the "IZVESTIYA Correspondents Comment" rubric: "New York: Strange Response"]

[Text] When asked to comment on M.S. Gorbachev's speech in London and the major new Soviet initiative proposed in it, President George Bush replied: "I have not seen or analyzed it. And, to be honest, cannot tell you that I know its full significance."

To be honest, after hearing that, you were bound to experience doubts. On Friday morning, as always on weekdays, the President received a series of briefings on foreign policy and national security matters from his chief staffers. I cannot imagine that the Soviet leader's speech, which the whole world was talking about by that time, was not discussed in any way at the briefings.

Incidentally, literally 1 hour after George Bush had preferred to decline to comment at the White House news conference (he said, among other things: "We will be ready to react when we feel like reacting.") State Department Spokesman Richard Boucher did make a more or less specific statement. And he could not make a statement without prior discussion of its content not only with the top leadership of the State Department but also with the White House. This is the procedure in the administration labyrinth here.

R. Boucher said the following: The Soviets still have a considerable potential for manufacturing nuclear materials. The measures announced by Gorbachev do not restrain the nuclear arms program. And these measures will not divert attention from the real problem: that of reducing the level of nuclear arms of both sides through negotiations.

The journalists attending the State Department briefing were, I saw, thrown into confusion. Say, one of them asked, do you see at least something positive in these measures? Do you consider them a step in the right or the wrong direction?

R. Boucher: It does not in general constitute a step, since there are in general no changes in Soviet nuclear production potential.

Question: But is it really a bad idea that both sides start reducing their production potentials? Do you object to this idea?

R. Boucher: I have no comment on this score. It has no real bearing on the problem of nuclear arms in the world. And it is precisely those problems that we are trying to get down to very seriously.... The point is not to make declarations but to work seriously in the arms control sphere.

It is difficult not to concur with the latter remark. The only thing is that neither Bush nor Boucher have made clear whether the administration is carrying out this serious work and how. When attempts were made at the news conference to draw out Bush on this question, he said what he had already said oft times: The United States is engaged in careful examination of its policy. When we are ready, we will discuss this with the Soviet Union. Mr Gorbachev knows that we are not dragging our feet.

Many people in Washington have a different viewpoint on whether or not the administration is dragging its feet. As THE NEW YORK TIMES notes, "The calls for the United States to respond creatively to what is happening in the world—the radical economic changes in Hungary, the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan, the new ideas on Central America, and the elections in the Soviet Union—are getting more and more powerful." "Despite the fact that both Bush and Brent Scowcroft, the President's national security assistant, have great experience in foreign policy," Lee Hamilton, member of the U.S. Congress House Foreign Affairs Committee, said, "the present administration is very, very cautious. But, from my standpoint," he added, "we have already reached the point where we must move from thinking to action. We should respond to their proposals, we should test their intentions, and make our own proposals."

For the time being, however, the situation is such that, as one major Capitol Hill expert remarked: "I have no idea what the administration's inclination is in the sphere of arms control or where it puts its emphasis—nuclear arms talks, as was the case under Reagan, or conventional types of arms, or something else."

According to information obtained by me at the Pentagon organization charged with implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative," the foreign policy review process should be completed by 10 May. Incidentally, it has been announced that Secretary of State James Baker's visit to the USSR will start that day. According to a State Department representative, questions falling within all the four basic baskets of Soviet-U.S. relations will be discussed in Moscow: human rights, the situation in various regions of the world, bilateral ties, and arms control. Clearly, it will then become quite apparent how seriously the present administration is ready to get down to reducing armaments and whether it has its own proposals and ideas in this sphere.

For the time being, however, it spurns other people's ideas....

U.S. Reactor Construction Noted

LD0904170389 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0956 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 9 Apr—TASS commentator Maksim Knyazkov writes:

In the West they are currently discussing and commenting in a lively fashion on the latest peace initiative from

the Soviet Union which was announced in London by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"A step along the path to nuclear disarmament" is how the Italian CORRIERE DELLA SERA assessed the Soviet Union's unilateral decision to end production of enriched uranium for military purposes in the current year; this paper can hardly be classed among the publications which sympathize with the USSR.

Other mass media and political and public figures speak in the same spirit, noting that in addition to the industrial reactor for the production of weapons grade plutonium which was closed in 1987, the USSR plans this year and next to shut down another two such reactors without starting new capacities to replace them.

But the reaction to this important new initiative in the United States makes one wonder seriously about how seriously Washington is committed to the intention once proclaimed by President Reagan of saving the world from nuclear weapons. It is not even that the new President, George Bush, has in essence said nothing so far on this topic. "I have not yet familiarized myself with the analysis of this report, so I really can't say what the overall significance of this step is," he said at his latest press conference.

Well, perhaps the President really does need time to interpret the significance of the Soviet step. But it turns out that the U.S. State Department has had plenty of time not just for analysis, but also to express its skepticism. According to its spokesman's statement, the steps announced by the Soviet Union "will not limit its program of nuclear arms production".

The Soviet Union naturally does not intend to damage its own security interests. But one gains the impression that they have not noticed the main thing in Washington. The main thing is that the USSR is adopting specific, realistic measures to restrict the industrial base of its nuclear arsenals, thereby once again demonstrating its adherence to the idea of creating a nuclear-free world. Were the United States to do the same, and if both sides were to put a stop to nuclear tests as soon as possible, said Eugene Carroll, retired U.S. admiral and a leader of the Washington Center for Defense Information, then this would lead to ending the build-up of nuclear arsenals. One cannot disagree.

Such a cool attitude from the United States to the Soviet Union's decision has, meanwhile, a wholly real explanation. The program for developing a new generation of nuclear reactors for military needs is presently being worked out in the United States. They will be installed at plants in Savannah River and Idaho Falls. The estimated cost of the program is $8 billion. Evidently, on the banks of the Potomac they would like to justify this expenditure in the eyes of the American public at any cost. And the Soviet initiative gets in their way.

Tactical Nuclear Arms 'Roadblock' to Safer Europe
LD0804111489 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—By TASS political observer Yuriy Kornilov:

Tactical nuclear arms remain to be a major roadblock along the road to a safer Europe.

The Soviet Union is willing to scrap these arms under the third zero option. The USSR is not and will not modernise its nukes unless compelled to do so. It vigorously opposes NATO plans to modernise tactical nuclear weapons because they openly violate the INF Treaty.

Certain Western circles however take quite a different approach to the problem and are clamoring for more upgraded weapons in Europe. They want an improved nuclear missile with a range of 50 kilometres [as received] to replace the Lance missiles (range - 130 km) and nurture plans to develop a new air-to-ground missile with a range of more than 400 kilometres and upgrade the SRAM Short Range Attack Missile, etc.

Such plans promote re-armament rather than disarmament and can only result in a nuclear build-up.

A statement by Hans-Jochen Vogel, chairman of the West German Social Democratic Party, that has just been published in Washington, reveals that the modernisation of Lance missiles deployed on West German soil has long been decided upon by the United States.

These are two different approaches to one and the same problem. And while in principle conflicting points of view are nothing new in human history, in this case such an attitude raises grave concerns from the public. It is clear that the modernisation of weapons leads to the preservation and a build up of nuclear arsenals and threatens European stability and peace. What is most important, the modernisation of these weapons can shatter the fragile trust that has been taking shape in Europe and will be a setback in the peace process. The modernisation of tactical nuclear weapons will certainly influence the Vienna talks, the confidence-building measures and the situation in Europe, Mikhail Gorbachev said recently in London.

Where is the way out?

It is probably in starting separate talks on tactical nuclear weapons along with the conventional arms negotiations in Vienna. The talks should aim to limit and then fully eliminate these weapons.

It will certainly be a difficult task because of the need to carefully analyse and discuss all sides of the problem, verification included. There is no room for foot-dragging on the issue. Europe needs an upgraded system of security based on fewer troops and fewer arms, nuclear arms in the first place, instead of upgraded missiles.

'Parity' Defined as 'Sufficiency' of Defense

18070583 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 13, 1-7 Apr 89 p 3

[Article by Ye. Klimchuk, candidate of historical sciences, docent, colonel: "When Was Parity Established?"]

[Text] I believe that it is more correct to define military-strategic parity not as equality in arms but as guaranteed sufficiency of forces to destroy an aggressor if he were to encroach on the USSR.

It is essential to dispel a myth that was introduced at one time by L.I. Brezhnev. He said that military-strategic parity had been established at the turn of the seventies. This definition found its way into all the dictionaries and also the published speeches of many state figures, but much here is strained and does not agree with the historical facts.

I think that the early sixties should be considered the correct time for the establishment of military-strategic parity.

By the early sixties the apparent strategic imbalance between the USSR and the United States was at first glance indisputable. According to former U.S. Secretary of Defense R. McNamara, in 1962 the United States had 17 times more nuclear warheads than the USSR. However, for an objective assessment of the state of affairs it is necessary to take into account the fact that the Soviet nuclear forces at that time were based mainly on rocket vehicles, in which we had an obvious superiority. We recall our first artificial Earth satellite and the launch of the first man into space, and also the fact that it was in 1960 that the Strategic Rocket Forces were set up in the USSR. We also recall that development of the U.S. Safeguard ABM system was initiated only in the mid-sixties; that is, at that time the territory of the United States was defenseless against Soviet missiles.

By 1961 the U.S. strategic nuclear forces were based mainly on bombers (of the 1,746 carrier vehicles for nuclear weapons 1,654 were B-47 and B-52 bombers and others). When analyzing the potential of those bombers it is not out of place to remember the status of the Soviet air defenses in the early sixties. Declassified Pentagon documents show that at that time in plans for war against the USSR the U.S. military were hoping that the overall effectiveness of the Soviet air defenses would be lower than during World War II. However, in modeling attacks against the USSR in 1957 the U.S. leadership had discovered with surprise that total losses by the Americans would be 55 percent of available air forces, that is, they would be catastrophically high and might cause a panic among flight crews, who would refuse to fly their missions (These facts and those cited below are taken from the Soviet periodical press).

Even the predictions of the American command were too optimistic. In the event of war with the USSR the U.S. Air Force could expect an even greater defeat because low-level flying was disastrous for it. Thus, the automatic antiaircraft gun mounts adopted by the USSR air defense forces in the fifties would have enabled them to take out a B-47 with a single shot. The probability of destroying aircraft with first-generation winged missiles was also quite high.

The U.S. Air Force later encountered Soviet missiles in Vietnam's air defense system and the American journal AIR FORCE SPACE DIGEST wrote that "they are the most deadly weapons that have ever been used against aircraft."

The remaining 92 nuclear weapons carriers (ICBM's and submarine-launched missiles) could in principle have carried out a strike against the USSR. But even here there was plenty of food for thought for the U.S. leadership, for in his speech to the 22nd CPSU Congress Marshal of the Soviet Union R.Ya. Malinovskiy said that the USSR had successfully solved the problem of destroying missiles in flight and that ABM forces had been created.

Thus, despite the 17:1 superiority of the United States in the field of strategic nuclear arms in the early sixties, R. McNamara had every reason for the dismal conclusion that in the event of a strike against the Soviet Union "dozens of its weapons would survive and would be launched against the United States." In other words, by the early sixties the USSR had the capability of using a retaliatory strike to destroy an aggressor, which, as mentioned above, also constitutes the essence of military-strategic parity.

Nuclear-Powered Submarine Sinks Off Norway Coast

TASS Reports Sinking, Loss of Life

LD0804080789 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—A fire broke out on board a Soviet nuclear-powered torpedo submarine in the international waters some 180 kilometres south-west from the Bear island at 11 hours 41 minutes on April 7.

Despite taken measures, the submarine sank at 17 hours 15 minutes at a depth of more than 1,500 metres.

The crew is being rescued by Soviet vessels in the area. There has been loss of life.

Specialists ruled out the possibility of a radioactive contamination of the environment.

A government commission has been set up to examine the causes of the accident.

Party, Government Express Condolences

LD0804130489 Moscow TASS in English 1256 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—The Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and the Council of Ministers expressed their condolences over the submarine accident on April 7.

Their message said:

"A nuclear-powered torpedo submarine caught fire in neutral waters in the Norwegian Sea on April 7. The crew's measures to extinguish the fire did not succeed. The submarine sank. There were casualties.

"The CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers express their deep condolences to the families, relatives and friends of those killed."

Yazov Comments

LD0804135589 Moscow TASS in English 1341 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—The fire on the Soviet nuclear-powered torpedo submarine which sank in neutral waters in the Norwegian Sea Friday [7 April], broke out in the seventh compartment and immediately spread to the sixth compartment, Soviet Defence Minister Dmitriy Yazov told IZVESTIYA.

In the interview published by the newspaper Saturday, Yazov said the crew for several hours tried to extinguish the fire but their efforts did not succeed. The submarine sank to a depth of more than 1,500 meters.

The minister said that a Soviet warship arrived to the disaster area three hours later. Then several more Soviet vessels came there. He expressed regret over the loss of life.

Yazov said the rescued crew members are now on board the warship which is heading for the Soviet port of Murmansk. Specialists have been sent to the disaster area to analyse the situation.

"We know for sure that the nuclear reactor is shut down. In the opinion of competent services, a radioactive contamination of the environment is ruled out," the minister said.

A government commission has been set up to investigate the cause of the accident.

The Communist Party Central Committee, the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers expressed their deep condolences to the families, relatives and friends of those killed.

Gorbachev Informs Thatcher, Bush

LD0804094889 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 0903 GMT 8 Apr 89

[By Chris Moncrieff, PRESS ASSOCIATION chief political correspondent]

[Text] President Mikhail Gorbachev sent a personal message of reassurance to Mrs Thatcher early today following the Soviet nuclear submarine accident off Norway.

Downing Street said the message was relayed by telephone from Mr Gorbachev's private office in Moscow—a few hours after he had returned home from his visit to Britain.

Mr Gorbachev told the prime minister the risk of explosion or contamination from the stricken submarine was "negligible" and also gave details of the location of the accident and said there had been loss of life.

In response, Mrs Thatcher's office conveyed to Mr Gorbachev "her condolences and sympathy for the families of those who lost their lives in the accident."

Downing Street also said Mr Gorbachev had assured Mrs Thatcher that the reactors had been shut down before the vessel sank.

The nuclear-powered submarine sank in the Arctic Ocean 300 miles north west of Norway after surfacing following an apparent accident under water.

Similar messages from Mr Gorbachev's office have been sent to President Bush and to the Norwegian prime minister, Mrs Gro Harlem Brundtland.

Radiation Leaks 'Ruled Out'

LD0904184289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1738 GMT 9 Apr 89

["USSR Submarine Accident—New Information"—TASS headline]

[Text] Murmansk, April 9 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vasiliy Belousov:

A fire flared up on a torpedo-carrying nuclear-powered submarine of the USSR Northern Fleet on April 7 in the neutral waters of the Norwegian Sea, southwest of Medvezhi Island. Measures taken by the crew failed to put out the fire. The submarine sank. A government commission was set up to investigate the causes of the accident.

The TASS correspondent was given some more details at the Northern Fleet Headquarters concerning the accident and the first results of the investigation. It turned out that the crew of the torpedo-carrying nuclear-powered submarine was made up of 69 men. Twenty-seven of them were saved. The crew of the submarine displayed courage in the struggle for keeping it afloat.

The submarine had on board two torpedoes with nuclear warheads. The design of the warheads completely rules out radiation threat during very deep submergence. To ensure radiation safety, the nuclear-powered engine was stopped and the power unit was effectively blanked off. Destruction of the reactor vessel [korpus reaktor] is ruled out.

The radiation situation in the accident area is being monitored [kontroliruyetsya] by the vessels which took part in the rescue operation. A set of special instruments is being used for that.

The analysis of air and water samples taken in the accident area revealed no signs of radioactive contamination. Radiation background does not exceed its natural value.

The government commission is continuing its work. Further results of the investigation will be reported later.

Tests Reveal No Radiation

LD0904134689 Moscow TASS in English 1335 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Oslo April 9 TASS—The Norwegian Institute for Radiation Protection has analysed water and air samples taken south-west of the Medvezhi Island, in the area where a Soviet submarine sank on April 7. No traces of radiation were revealed, the Norwegian News Agency reports.

Surface water samples were collected on Saturday morning by the Norwegian Coast Guard vessel Marlene Estervold and were taken by helicopter to the Bodoe Air Base and from there by warplane to Oslo. Rough tests of the air samples were made at a laboratory of Tromso University. The analysis of scrapings from Norwegian Orion reconnaissance aircraft that was the first to fly in the accident area did not show any abnormal radioactivity either.

Later on Coast Guard vessels will take large-depth water samples, the Norwegian News Agency says.

Rescue Operations Detailed

LD1004084889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0801 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Murmansk, 10 Apr (TASS)—TASS correspondent Vasiliy Belousov reports:

At the Northern Fleet Headquarters, journalists were given details of the loss of the nuclear-powered torpedo submarine that sank on 7 April in neutral waters of the Norwegian Sea, southwest of Bear Island.

After the fire broke out on the submarine, the commander of the vessel reported this to fleet headquarters. The rescue vessel "Karabakh" put to sea immediately. Instructions were given to other military and civilian ships near the incident to go to the assistance of the submariners. Special planes also flew to the region of the disaster and dropped rescue rafts onto the water.

The Soviet factory ship "Aleksey Khlobystov" turned out to be closer to the accident location than the others. Its crew also picked up the rafts with the submariners who were suffering from exposure, but were still alive. They were given first aid aboard the factory ship. The casualties were then put on board a warship, which took them to a hospital.

In the view of members of the governmental commission set up to investigate this tragic incident, the crew of the submarine acted courageously and competently in the emergency. The sailors fought for the life of the ship to the last moment, but when the end came they had time to shut down the reactor and insure complete radiation safety.

Of the 69 crew members, 42 sailors died, including the commander of the submarine. The survivors were hospitalized. Only the members of the governmental commission have been allowed to meet them so far, and then only for a few minutes.

Ships of the Northern Fleet are continuing to patrol the incident area, the journalists were told. They are searching for the bodies of the dead seamen that have not been found yet and are keeping an eye on the radiation situation. According to reports from the incident area, background radiation here does not exceed normal levels.

Submarine Sinking Reported by Domestic Press, TV

Yazov's Interviewed

PM0804155789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Telephone interview with USSR Defense Minister D.T. Yazov conducted by own correspondent R. Ignatyev: "Loss of Submarine"; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Our correspondent telephoned D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister. This is what he said:

"A fire broke out in the submarine's seventh compartment. It instantly spread to the sixth compartment. The personnel tried for several hours to extinguish the fire. However, they were unable to deal with the raging blaze. And the submarine sank.

"A Soviet ship arrived in the disaster area 3 hours later. Subsequently several more of our ships and vessels arrived. Life rafts were dropped to the survivors from aircraft. Unfortunately, it was not possible to save everyone: There are fatalities. The submarine crew is now aboard a warship which is heading for Murmansk. Specialists are arriving on the scene, they will study the situation prevailing after the accident. We are reliably informed that the atomic reactor was shut down [nam dostoverno izvestno, chto atomnyy reaktor zaglushen]. In the opinion of the competent services, radioactive contamination of the environment is ruled out."

42 Dead, 27 Survive

PM0904185789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 2

[R. Ignatyev report: "Causes of Loss of Submarine Being Established"]

[Text] As we have already reported (IZVESTIYA No 99), a Soviet torpedo-carrying, nuclear-powered submarine has sunk in neutral waters of the Norwegian Sea as a result of a fire. It has been indicated that there are also casualties. Your correspondent contacted USSR Defense Minister D.T. Yazov. He related the following:

"A Soviet warship bringing the crew of the sunken submarine arrived in Murmansk at 0900 hours 9 April. Out of the full complement, 27 survived and 42 died. A government commission has begun elucidating the cause of the outbreak of the fire and all the circumstances of the tragedy. Corresponding work is also being carried out in the disaster area."

IZVESTIYA contacted by telephone S.P. Vagrin, member of the Military Council and chief of the Political Directorate of the Northern Fleet.

"At the present time (1410 hours, 9 April) the government commission is in session," he said. "A report by Admiral F.N. Gromov, commander of the Northern Fleet, has already been heard. According to preliminary data, the fire was caused by a short circuit. The fire broke out when the submarine was returning from a long voyage and was submerged. As soon as the accident occurred, the submarine surfaced. All Soviet vessels in the area were ordered to alter course and proceed to the assistance of the crew of the stricken submarine. Aircraft were also involved. The crew conducted themselves courageously and fought to the last. However, it was not possible to save the vessel and it sank to the bottom. Some of the crew drowned with the submarine.

"The crew has been hospitalized. They are undergoing examination and being given all necessary medical assistance.

"We already know the exact location of the sunken submarine. Investigations are continuing."

We were able to make telephone contact with the hospital to which the personnel of the sunken submarine have been admitted. We were told that all 27 survivors have been taken there. The sailors were found to be suffering from hypothermia. Only in two of them is it of medium severity. The crew is to undergo a course of treatment.

'Military Review' Describes Incident

LD0904165189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 9 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; "Military Review" presented by Valeriy Voloshin]

[Text] Hello, comrades. Soviet Armed Forces are becoming more and more open. Such is the reality of the new political thinking, democratization, and glasnost. The military review that we begin sees its purpose in speaking openly about the Army and Navy. This is the wish of television viewers; they would like to know more about who is defending them.

Of course, we are all concerned with the fate of the crew of the Soviet submarine that had an accident near Bear Island. This was reported in the "Vremya" program yesterday. Today the "Kirov" atomic-power cruiser brought the surviving Army sailors to Murmansk. The state of their health does not cause worry. For nearly 5 and ½ hours they selflessly fought the fire that broke out while they were at sea. They tried to do all they could to save the ship. When fire engulfed the sixth compartment, the submarine was under water. The crew did not panic and employed all means available to localize and extinguish the fire. When the submarine surfaced, there were winds with a gale force of 3. Without panicking the sailors promptly carried out the commander's orders and struggled to keep the ship in operational condition. They did not succeed, however.

Naval aircraft were sent to their rescue and dropped rafts. Navy ships and fishermen also came to their rescue. The causes of the fire are being investigated. It is clear even now, however, that Soviet sailors displayed courage and heroism. They did their military duty. We bow our heads, remembering those who died.

Absence of 'Fuller' News Decried

PM0904131589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 89 Second Edition p 6

[A. Ivanov article: "Emergency Situation: Tragedy at Sea"]

[Text] Just like 2 and ½ years ago, when a Soviet atomic-powered submarine carrying ballistic missiles sank to a great depth 1,000 km northeast of the Bermudas, a fire in one of the compartments was the cause of the destruction in the area of Bear Island of the torpedo-armed submarine returning from a long voyage.

At approximately 1500 hours a Soviet ship arrived in time to render assistance to the crew, who had fought the blaze unsuccessfully, to be immediately followed into the disasater area by several others. Aircraft also rendered assistance.

The leading Western news agencies have transmitted and continue to transmit extensive commentaries. The promptness with which the Soviet authorities informed the governments and public of many countries of the tragedy, assuring them in so doing of the absence of radioactive contamination, is noted. They describe the type of submarine according to its NATO classification, its armaments, number of crew (95), and number of dead (12).... To be honest, an elementary analysis of all these reports shows that the absence of fuller information allows or forces our foreign colleagues to speculate in a very broad and pretty free-ranging manner about the technical and human dimensions. Although, it is clear even to the nonspecialist that at the moment it is extremely difficult to form a reliable picture of the causes of the fire.

In this connection I would note that we on PRAVDA have, unfortunately, been deprived of even the information that went abroad following the official report. Soviet military representatives whom we approached have displayed an enviable indifference, refusing to make any comment whatsoever. Yet USSR Defense Minister D.T. Yazov did nevertheless find a few minutes to give a brief interview to IZVESTIYA.

PRAVDA journalists express their sincere condolences to the sailors of the Northern Fleet and to the relatives and friends of the deceased. We bow our heads in memory of the servicemen who died at their combat post.

Gremitskiy Gives Foreign Ministry Briefing 7 Apr

Shamir, Mubarak U.S. Visit Noted

LD0704151689 Moscow TASS in English 1448 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—The Israeli idea of conducting elections in the Jordan West Bank and Gaza Strip, brought to Washington by Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir, hides the aspiration to circumvent the Palestine Liberation Organisation, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a briefing in Moscow today.

Yuriy Gremitskiy, first deputy head of the ministry's Information Directorate, stated that the Israeli plan envisages the selection of Palestinian representatives for participation in direct bilateral talks with Israel.

This amounts to an attempt to push aside the PLO, the sole legitimate representative of the Arab people of Palestine as recognised by the entire international community, the spokesman said.

Egyptian President Husni Mubarak, also in the United States, told an American television network that the Israeli plan is a serious mistake and is incapable of resolving the problem.

The Soviet stance on the Middle East settlement, including on Palestinian representation, is well known, Gremitskiy said. "Naturally, proposals of that kind cannot win support from our side," he added.

As to the U.S. position, it features no new elements, Gremitskiy said. Nonetheless, one cannot fail to notice the striving towards advancement of the Middle East settlement, repeatedly expressed by representatives of the American Administration.

"It seems that the U.S. Administration is now more busy familiarising itself with the positions of directly involved sides in order to determine more clearly its own stand," Gremitskiy said.

"If that is so, one can hope that the meeting between the U.S. secretary of state and the Soviet foreign minister, slated for next May, will enable the Americans and us to discuss more specifically and in greater detail the Middle East subjects. For our part, we are ready for that," said the Soviet spokesman.

Afghanistan Situation Updated

LD0704152689 Moscow TASS in English 1453 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—The appointment of a special U.S. representative to the Afghan armed opposition is not conducive to a peaceful settlement of the

Afghan conflict and can even exacerbate the fratricidal war in Afghanistan since it looks effectively as a gesture of encouragement for extremists, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

Yuriy Gremitskiy, first deputy chief of the ministry's Information Directorate, noted that this step is at variance with the commitments made by the U.S. under the Geneva agreements as a guarantor of the fulfillment of these accords, and contradicts a resolution adopted by consensus at the 43rd session of the U.N. General Assembly and calling for action to encourage and assist an early and comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan.

He said that the Afghan opposition is continuing to concentrate armed groups in the area of Kabul. The latest meeting of field commanders belonging to different parties made the barbarous decision to shell residential districts in the capital intensively and commit acts of terrorism and sabotage during Ramadan, the Islamic month of fasting. Last Thursday Kabul militiamen discovered and disposed of a powerful explosive device.

Tensions are continuing also in Khowst District where rebels attacked security outposts, in addition to shelling the city. The attacks, however, have been repulsed.

Along with attempting to solve the Afghan problem by military means, the opposition is seeking to tighten the noose of the economic blockade of Afghanistan, Gremitskiy said.

"This is why the U.N. economic and humanitarian aid programme is so important for that country," he added. The spokesman went on to say that the U.N. coordinator of this programme, Aga Khan, recently praised the Soviet contribution to it.

The U.N. official noted that the Soviet aid has no political strings attached and U.N. personnel have possibilities to distribute it where and to whom they think necessary.

"One would like to hope that U.N. member states will increase their efforts to give humanitarian assistance to the Afghan people," Gremitskiy said.

Cuba, UK Visits Cited

LD0704151189 Moscow TASS in English 1419 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—Hopes for deeper constructive Soviet-British cooperation in handling burning issues of the times, above all in the sphere of disarmament and settlement of regional conflicts, are being pinned here on the Soviet leader's official visit to Britain, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today.

Yuriy Gremitskiy, first deputy head of the ministry's Information Directorate, addressing a regular briefing for Soviet and foreign newsmen, stated that Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Cuba demonstrated inviolability of friendly Soviet-Cuban relations and promised their secure future that has been sealed in the treaty of friendship and cooperation.

On the situation related to Afghanistan, Gremitskiy emphasised that "the appointment of a U.S. representative with the armed Afghan opposition is not conducive to a peaceful settlement of the Afghan conflict. Moreover, it may bring about intensification of the fratricidal war, being, in fact, a gesture of encouragement for the extremists."

Although a U.S. State Department spokesperson noted that the appointment of the special representative does not imply U.S. official recognition of the Afghan "interim government," this step, "no matter what motivation, contradicts the commitments assumed by the United States under the Geneva agreements as a guarantor of the implementation of these accords and runs counter to the revolution, approved by consensus at the 43rd session of the U.N. General Assembly, calling for encouraging and alleviating the earliest comprehensive political settlement in Afghanistan," Gremitskiy said.

According to American press reports, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir brought to Washington an idea of elections in the Jordan West Bank and Gaza Strip to choose Palestinian representatives for participation in direct bilateral talks with Israel.

Commenting on this plan, the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said that "it hides an obvious aspiration to circumvent the PLO which is recognised by the international community as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people."

Soviet-West German consultations on international legal issues were held in Moscow by heads of juridical services of the Soviet and West German foreign ministries, Gremitskiy announced.

Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy and a delegation from the U.N. association of the United States of America and representatives of the Ford Foundation exchanged views in Moscow on the issue of internationalising inter-state relations.

United States & Canada

Baker's 10-11 May Moscow Visit Announced

LD0704142189 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—It has been officially announced here that under agreement reached U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will pay an official visit to Moscow on May 10-11, 1989.

U.S. To Close Afghan Embassy in Washington

LD0904085489 Moscow TASS in English 0836 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] New York April 9 TASS—The U.S. Administration is planning to close down the Embassy of the Republic of Afghanistan in Washington, the ABC television network reported on Saturday.

It became known to ABC representatives from informed sources that U.S. Secretary of State James Baker is due to announce a decision to this effect soon and to suggest that Afghan diplomats leave the country.

At the same time the report emphasised that Washington did not intend officially to break off diplomatic relations with Afghanistan.

ABC recalled that earlier this week the administration had taken a decision to appoint a special representative at ambassadorial rank to the camp of the Afghan armed opposition. This had been designed to raise the latter's prestige. An expulsion of Afghan diplomats from Washington would become a continuation of that policy.

Former U.S. Ambassador to Afghanistan Robert Neumann has pointed out that it is a question of diplomatic manoeuvres the purpose of which is for the USA to get farther away from the Najibullah government.

According to informed sources, a decision on the expulsion of Afghan diplomats from the country is to give additional psychological support to the Afghan armed opposition forces at a time when their attempts at seizing the city of Jalalabad are turning out to be futile.

U.S. Motives in Mideast Consultations Questioned

PM0704141789 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Military-Political Review": "What 'Activeness'?"]

[Text] These days the problems of the Near East are the center of attention in Washington. Egyptian President H. Mubarak's visit to the United States has just ended. G. Bush is to meet Israeli Prime Minister I. Shamir in the White House today. He will in turn be succeeded by King Husayn of Jordan.

Such Near Eastern "activeness" could not fail to provoke lively commentaries in the American press. However, most observers are questioning the official version, which presents Washington's current actions as an endeavor to finally get the process of seeking a peaceful political settlement in the Near East moving. According to them, it is really a question of neutralizing in some way the results of USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze's recent tour of a number of the countries in the Near East region. This is because the U.S. upper echelons greeted with clear dissatisfaction reports that there had been a substantial increase in favorable sentiments in the Arab world concerning an international peace conference on the Near East, under the auspices of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, as a result of the talks held with the head of the Soviet foreign policy department.

Everything indicates that people in Washington realize that the development of events in and around the Near East demands that the White House define its strategy for resolving this, one of the most protracted and complex regional conflicts. Nevertheless, at present Washington is unable to make any constructive proposals. In order to win time, people there intend to familiarize themselves first with the proposals made by Mubarak, Shamir, and Husayn and only then try to find common points of contact on which accords could be reached in future.

Thus, following his meeting with H. Mubarak, G. Bush acknowledged the "usefulness" of holding a "properly organized" international conference on the Near East. However, he immediately indicated that the United States prefers an "all-embracing settlement via direct talks." At the same time, G. Bush noted that Israel must finally agree to establish direct dialogue with the Palestinians, although he did not mention the PLO at this point.

G. Bush has a meeting with I. Shamir next. American observers are suggesting that the U.S. President will attempt to persuade the head of the Israeli Cabinet during this meeting to somewhat soften his hard line and at least agree not to completely rule out the possibility of talks with the PLO. There is no harm in trying, as the saying goes, but on his departure, I. Shamir confirmed once again his adherence to the three "No's." No to ending the occupation of the Arab territories; no to talks with the PLO; and no to the creation of an independent Palestinian state. Considering all previous experience of relations between the "strategic allies," it is hard to imagine that the United States intends to insist on its demands of Israel this time, especially since it became known the day before I. Shamir's trip that the Pentagon is supplying Israel with another major arms consignment, including F-16 fighter bombers.

Meanwhile, the situation in the occupied Arab territories is becoming extremely heated. The Israeli authorities are

taking increasingly harsher measures aimed at conclusively suppressing the "intifadah"—the general Palestinian uprising. However, the Palestinians are full of determination to win victory in their just struggle, in which they are supported by the world community. It is not ostentatious activeness that is needed but concrete actions aiming to really resolve a potentially most dangerous conflict—the Near East conflict—to ensure that the entire Near East does not find itself once again obscured by the clouds of war.

Bush, Shamir Talks 'Aggravate' Palestinian Problem
LD0704193989 Moscow TASS in English 1910 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—By TASS political observer Albert Balebanov:

Talks have been held in Washington between Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir of Israel and U.S. President George Bush. The Middle East settlement was the centrepiece of their discussions. The world expected some changes in the stand of Israel which is blocking the efforts of the world community aimed at settling the Arab-Israeli conflict for which the Palestinian problem is the central one. However, judging by an official report on the results of the talks, nothing out of the ordinary took place at the meeting.

Contrary to the U.N. resolution which provides for the creation on Palestinian territory of two states, the Palestinian and Jewish ones, Shamir again opposed the creation of an independent Palestinian state on Israeli-occupied territory. The only thing to which he agreed during the Washington talks was to organise elections on the occupied lands which are to determine who will be included in a delegation to hold talks with Israel on the type of administration that Tel Aviv will permit Palestinians to have within the framework of limited autonomy which is planned for them. According to the Western press, the U.S. President supported the idea of the elections.

The American-Israeli accord on the election problem seems to be a step aside from the path that really leads to a settlement. If both sides were truly interested in finding a way to a settlement, they should have discussed the convocation of an international conference on the Middle East under the U.N. aegis which is being supported by most of the countries. However, this did not happen.

The situation in the region is such that all the talk about elections cannot resolve the Palestinian problem. On the contrary, they can only aggravate it. It is not quite clear what is there to decide with the help of elections, if the Palestine Liberation Organisation has been recognized as a representative of the whole of the Palestinian nation. One can understand why the Palestinian leaders were so disappointed at the results of the talks. They stressed that the Washington accords made no mention of the key problem—the creation of a Palestinian state with the help of an international conference in which the PLO should take part.

Results of Bush Foreign Policy Review Revealed
LD0904170589 Moscow TASS in English 1625 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Washington April 9 TASS—According to newspapers, U.S. President George Bush was given this week three detailed reports prepared by the CIA, the State Department, the Pentagon and the National Security Council which contained recommendations on a number of aspects of the U.S. foreign policy.

"Three classified reports, presented to President Bush last week as part of a lengthy review of U.S. foreign policy, have recommended no major new initiatives toward Europe or the Soviet Union, offering no support for dramatic arms cuts or sharply expanded economic cooperation with the East, U.S. officials disclosed", THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on Sunday. On the contrary, the newspaper pointed out, the reports determined instead that the administration should closely follow current policies, largely developed during Ronald Reagan's Presidency, toward Eastern and Western Europe and toward the Soviet Government.

According to an official quoted by THE WASHINGTON POST, the report on the Soviet Union urged that U.S. policy "should not be designed either to help or hurt" the USSR. As for trade relations between the two countries, the report was sceptical that U.S.-Soviet trade can or should be dramatically increased, partly because of wide economic differences. At the same time, the report recommended to expand a dialogue with the USSR on the settlement of regional conflicts and the activisation of joint efforts in the struggle against terrorism and the proliferation of chemical and nuclear weapons.

The analysis is likely to disappoint critics who favour more dramatic moves to improve relations, THE NEW YORK TIMES wrote on Sunday. Final policy decisions on relations with the USSR are more likely to be thrashed out among Mr. Bush and small circle of high-level advisers.

Concerning the European socialist countries, THE WASHINGTON POST wrote that the report supports the policy of "differentiation", or support for those nations taking the greatest steps toward democratic reforms.

According to THE WASHINGTON POST, the report on Western Europe did not support growing calls in some NATO member-nations for dramatic reductions in NATO forces, in concert with larger cuts in Warsaw Pact

forces. "The report also takes a middle road on the issue of European economic integration in 1992, urging cautious U.S. support combined with vigilant opposition to trade barriers, officials said".

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sihanouk, Hun Sen To Meet 2, 3 May in Jakarta

BK1004145589 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Samdech Norodom Sihanouk has expressed the hope that the upcoming meeting with the chairman of the Cambodian Council of Ministers, Hun Sen, will produce positive results for solving the Cambodian problem. Samdech Norodom Sihanouk's coming meeting with the head of the Cambodian Government is planned for 2 and 3 May in Jakarta.

In previous meetings, the two sides tried to bring their positions closer to each other on a number of issues. In Bangkok, the samdech hoped that following Vietnam's announcement on a Vietnamese troop pullout before the end of September, progress would be made on solving the problem.

'Opportune' Joint Indochina Statement Welcomed

PM1004105989 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 3

[A. Golts "International Notes": "Firm Stance"]

[Text] The governments of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia recently issued a joint statement. It indicates that the withdrawal of all Vietnamese volunteer troops should be completed by late September. All foreign interference and foreign aid to all Cambodian sides should have stopped by that time. An international commission comprising representatives of Ireland, Poland, and Canada is supposed to be supervising these measures. It has been proposed that the chairman of the second informal meeting on Cambodia in Jakarta and the UN secretary general's personal representative participate in it.

One cannot fail to see that the statement formulating the approach of the three Indochina countries to the settlement of this chronic regional conflict has been issued at a highly opportune time. The point is that the current situation around Cambodia appears far more complex than even a few weeks ago. Then the world public was gratified by the results of that meeting in Jakarta. These results quite definitely pointed to the real possibility of finding a political solution to Cambodia's problems. It is no coincidence that the statement issued by the meeting's chairman spoke of consensus, that is, of an accord reached on a number of questions by representatives of the People's Republic of Kampuchea [PRK] Government, the three opposition groupings, and also the representatives of Vietnam, Laos and the ASEAN countries. One got the impression that, notwithstanding the gravity of the unsolved problems and the existing contradictions, progress could be made. It was also obvious that the overall trend toward relaxing tension in the region and, in particular, the development of political contacts between the USSR and the PRC and the beginning of Vietnamese-Chinese dialogue facilitated such progress.

But, evidently, the emergent possibilities alarmed precisely those forces that were interested in continuing the fratricidal war and in continuing the Cambodian people's sufferings. Thus, people in the United States have begun to speak of the need to increase military aid to "the noncommunist groupings." Let us recall that this means the groupings headed by Prince Norodom Sihanouk and Son Sann, who are forming an antigovernment coalition with Pol Pot's supporters. At present the United States is sending then "nonoffensive" military equipment worth $5.5 million. There are plans to increase this aid by $2 million in the next fiscal year. The press has even hinted that G. Bush has already promised N. Sihanouk this. It is clear that in the prevailing situation such support is nothing but fresh fuel to throw on the embers of a dying conflict.

U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker's recent statement that the Pol Pot cutthroats are a "fact of life" that must be taken into consideration also aroused considerable public concern. "The idea that we should recognize the butchers who exterminated 1-3 million of their compatriots solely because they were able to read and write makes us shudder," THE WASHINGTON POST observer M. McGrory wrote justly.

Such actions on the part of the United States and certain other countries are clearly setting the Khmer opposition on the warpath. Opposition groupings have already set up some "Higher National Defense Council" and are issuing bellicose statements. One cannot fail to consider that the most efficient and numerous Pol Pot grouping is a member of this "coalition." Consequently there is the danger that a terrible genocidal regime may seize power within the country.

In this situation the three fraternal countries of Indochina have very definitely indicated their desire to continue to strive for a political solution to the Cambodian problem. The decision to bring the Vietnamese volunteers home at the end of September 1989 attests to this. At a press conference in Phnom Penh, Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers and PRK foreign minister, stated that this decision was taken after profound analysis of the balance of military forces and said that Cambodia can defend itself following the withdrawal of the Vietnamese troops. At the same time the joint statement stressed that, if foreign states do not cease military aid to the opposition, above all the Pol Pot clique, and if there is a possibility of their return to power, the PRK reserves the right to urge other states to

offer the Cambodian people support in self-defense. This is in strict accordance with the UN Charter and the principles of the Nonaligned Movement. This is their firm and clear stance.

SRV's Nguyen Co Thach Interviewed on Cambodia

PM0704105289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Nguyen Co Thach, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) Central Committee and SRV foreign minister, by IZVESTIYA Hanoi correspondent B. Vinogradov: "Cambodia's Problems Are Close to Solution"—date of interview not stated]

[Text] [Vinogradov] Comrade Minister, the governments of Laos, the People's Republic of Kampuchea [PRK], and the SRV have just made a joint statement saying that Vietnam is to withdraw its troops by the end of September 1989....

[Nguyen] The statement says that the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops should be linked to the prevention of the restoration of the Pol Pot genocide regime in Cambodia, the ending of military aid to all Cambodian parties, and also the cessation of outside interference, as was enshrined in the accords reached at the Jakarta meetings. Their fulfillment will create the conditions for accelerating the resolution of internal aspects of the Cambodian problems.

[Vinogradov] How should we understand the term "political settlement"?

[Nguyen] A settlement could take two forms: the signing of an agreement, and the attainment of an agreement that does not require signing. An important feature at the first stage would be a cease-fire and the commencement of talks. The linkage of the troop withdrawal and the schedule for stopping weapon deliveries should be mentioned here. It would be logical to begin reducing military aid down to its total curtailment from the moment of the cease-fire—after all, once the guns are silent, who needs weapons? All deliveries of arms and ammunition after the entry into force of a cease-fire agreement will be aimed at undermining that agreement. The countries that took part in the Jakarta meeting pledged not to give military aid to the Cambodian parties immediately after the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops. We also welcome China's intention to follow suit. In our opinion this pledge provides a reliable basis for a settlement. And any violation will lead to the complication of the situation, create the conditions for the return of the Pol Pot genocide to Cambodia, cause a new civil war, and constitute an infringement of Cambodia's sovereignty and the Cambodian people's peaceful life. In this case, as the statement notes, the PRK will retain the right to ask other countries for assistance, in accordance with the UN Charter and the principles of the Nonaligned Movement.

[Vinogradov] The general opinion is that the Jakarta meetings advanced the resolution of the Cambodian problem. But they also revealed certain disagreements among the participants.

[Nguyen] No one doubted the principle that the internal aspect of the problem should be resolved exclusively by the Cambodian parties without outside interference. Through the holding of free general elections, the people of Cambodia will themselves decide their future and create whatever state system they deem necessary. In Jakarta, the Cambodian parties were unable to form a united opinion concerning the provisional power mechanism that would operate from the moment of the attainment of agreement until the holding of the elections. The consultations on this question will continue. In general the two Jakarta meetings marked the start of a new phase in relations among the Southeast Asian countries, characterized by the transition from confrontation to mutual understanding and cooperation. My recent tour of a number of ASEAN countries confirmed us in this opinion. We intend to continue to develop the process that began in Jakarta.

[Vinogradov] The internal aspect of the Cambodian problem is still a long way from being resolved. Furthermore the formation of a so-called "Supreme National Defense Council" headed by Sihanouk was announced in Beijing recently. How could this influence the whole course of a settlement?

[Nguyen] The situation is rather like the closing minutes of a tense soccer game. Everyone wants to score a goal, but it is hard to do so. It is also possible, in the confusion, to score an "own goal." If I was a soldier in the forces of the three opposition groupings, I would be afraid to fight under the prince's banner. As commander, he could now give the signal to attack, change his mind a few hours later, and then drive them into battle again. In the course of a single day he could revise his orders several times. It is no accident that virtually everywhere this event was assessed rather skeptically, and even the newspapers that support Sihanouk gave the laudatory commentaries a miss this time. It is clear that the opposition is maneuvering. It has to create an appearance of cohesion. In 10 years the PRK's positions have strengthened to such an extent that only people who have lost a sense of reality and responsibility can seriously count on the armed overthrow of its government. The formation of the "Supreme Council," it must be said, runs counter to the interests of peace and stability. Sihanouk could play a more constructive part, but that depends on whom he chooses to advance with—the Pol Pot supporters or the people.

[Vinogradov] A few words, please, about international verification.

[Nguyen] The verification mechanism still has to be formulated. As was agreed in Jakarta and indicated in the joint statement, we propose that the international

verification commission for observing the fulfillment of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Cambodia consisting of India, Poland, and Canada, with the participation of the chairman of the second Jakarta meeting and the personal representative of the UN secretary general, take on these functions. Their tasks will include observing how the accords are being fulfilled and recording possible violations. it is a question of verifying the withdrawal of troops, the prevention of the restoration of the Pol Pot regime, the ending of military aid, the holding of elections, and so forth. But in this context Cambodia's sovereignty must be respected. The three opposition groupings are calling for the use of international peacekeeping forces, that is, the sending of UN troops into Cambodia. In Jakarta we acknowledged that it is the duty and task of the Cambodian parties themselves to keep the peace in the country.

[Vinogradov] The term "post-Cambodia period" has already appeared in the press. Hopes for widening cooperation in the region are pinned on this. How do you assess, in this ccntext, the present state of relations between the countries of Indochina and ASEAN? What future do these relations have?

[Nguyen] Economists are now drawing up options for cooperation in the period after the resolution of the Cambodia problems. There are good prospects. And various contacts are already being developed comparatively actively at state level and at the level of individual firms between the countries of Indochina and ASEAN. Remember the sensation that was caused by Hun Sen's first trip to Thailand in January of this year. I think this trend will persist in future. It has a good influence on the process of creating a zone of peace, stability, and cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region. M.S. Gorbachev's well-known Vladivostok speech in 1986 has a galvanizing effect on the implementation of this large-scale program, which meets the interests of all countries and peoples of the region.

[Vinogradov] The world public assesses as a positive feature the improvement that has emerged in relations between the SRV and China. What, in your view, are the prospects for the normalization of Vietnamese-Chinese relations?

[Nguyen] Relations of friendship have existed for centuries between the two neighboring countries—Vietnam and China. Unfortunately, in the last 10 years they have been overshadowed by disagreements. Normalization is equally desirable to both our peoples, it accords with the interests of socialism. The two countries' inhabitants now visit each other in the border regions and conduct trade exchange. There was a meeting between deputy foreign ministers, at which questions of the normalization of bilateral relations and the Cambodia problem were discussed. Vietnam proposed a time for the next meeting, and is still awaiting an answer from the Chinese side. Since 1982 the PRC leadership has stated repeatedly that all that is needed is a schedule for the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, and then it will embark on normalization. We hope words will be followed by deeds.

We also welcome the normalization of USSR-PRC relations. M.S. Gorbachev's forthcoming visit to Beijing will, in our opinion, be a weighty contribution to the improvement of the international atmosphere throughout the world, and in Southeast Asia in particular.

[Vinogradov] The "open door" policy promotes the expansion of Vietnam's economic ties with the outside world. How does it relate to the SRV's cooperation with the CEMA countries and the Soviet Union?

[Nguyen] For 40 years socialist Vietnam was constantly subjected to blockade and political isolation by the imperialist states. The Soviet Union and the other socialist countries gave us enormous, invaluable assistance during the struggle for national independence and in the postwar period. We regard friendship and cooperation with the Soviet Union and the socialist community coutnries as the cornerstone of our foreign policy. At the same time, on the basis of equality and mutual advantage, we are expanding economic and trade ties with other states. But as before, the Soviet Union remains our main partner. We are united by common goals and interests, the strengthening of the positions of socialism, and the tasks of improving our internal economic management mechanisms. We are also getting rid of the command-and-administer system and creating a new management structure to enable us to give more freedom to enterprise and utilize progressive forms of business ties. The reforms being carried out in the socialist countries provide the conditions for increasing the effectiveness of our cooperation.

Dismantling of Subic, Cam Ranh Bases Sought

OW0704144589 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 4 Apr 89

[Interview with Captain First Class Viktor (Varisov), who until recently served in Cam Ranh, by unidentified reporter on the proposal of "Dismantling the Soviet Logistic Support Base in Cam Ranh and the United States Miltary Naval Base in Subic Bay"—live or recorded at the Naval Command Station for the Pacific Ocean in Vladivostok; date not given]

[Text] Listener friends, the following material deals with the USSR's proposal for the simultaneous dismantling of the Soviet material supply station at Cam Ranh Bay and the U.S. Subic Naval Base in the Philippines. The proposal has attracted worldwide attention, particularly that of the countries in the Asia-Pacific region.

Our station reporter recently interviewed Captain (Varisov) of the Staff Department of the Soviet Pacific Fleet in Vladivostok, who had just completed his tour of duty at Cam Ranh Bay not long ago. The following is their dialogue.

The first question: What kind of station is the material supply station at Cam Ranh Bay?

Navy Captain (Varisov) said: After consultation with the government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Soviet Union began to build the supply station for the warships of its Pacific Fleet in 1979. The name of the station accords with its function. That is, when needed, it supplies fuel, water, fresh vegetables, and fruit to Soviet warships that have been at sea for a long period of time in the Pacific and Indian Oceans. In addition, after a long journey, sailors can have a rest at the station or bathe at the beaches. These are its functions. I can give the following data: Soviet warships simultaneously in port at Cam Ranh Bay have never exceeded 10. There are altogether seven docks, and the capacity of the oil tanks is less than 7,000 metric tons. The capacity for storing munitions is small, only 1/300 of that of the U.S. Subic Naval Base.

Question: What role does the Cam Ranh station play regarding the Soviet fleet?

Answer: We need the station very much, but it only plays a supplementary role. In answering the first question, I have said that the voyages in the Pacific and Indian Oceans are long. Our warships need resupplies, and the sailors also need rest. At the same time, I can say that this role can be replaced by other methods, such as a mobile method. For example, the resupply of fuel and foodstuffs and providing a place for the sailors to rest at sea. To serve this purpose, we can use our tankers and cold storage ships. We also have hospital ships for the sick.

Question: How do you assess the Soviet proposal on the simultaneous dismantling of the Soviet material supply station at Cam Ranh Bay and the U.S. Subic Naval Base in the Philippines?

Answer: This proposal was made by Comrade Gorbachev in Vladivostok in 1986. It is aimed at improving the military and political situation in Southeast Asia. Of course it was an (?appropriate and wise) proposal.

Comrade (Varisov) said: If I may say so, personally I think this is a policy based on new thinking.

Question: However, the United States has asserted that this is an unequal exchange. What do you think of this?

Answer: Everyone knows that the U.S. air and naval bases in the Philippines have caused tension in this region. (?It is also true that Subic is bigger than Cam Ranh Bay). However, if we talk about new thinking, we should compare everything. It should be noted that we made a concession in the Soviet-U.S. INF Treaty by allowing more Soviet missiles to be destroyed than those of the United States. We made this concession in the interest of peace. I think one should not haggle over things that concern the security and interest of the world. Dismantling the military installations in Southeast Asia will substantially strengthen peace and trust in this region.

Question: The United States has asserted that the Soviet Union operates the Cam Ranh material supply station without the approval of the Vietnamese side. How do you explain this?

Answer: I know that the establishment of the material supply station at Cam Ranh Bay was based on documents showing the approval of Vietnam. Therefore, the mutual relations between our two countries are based on this type of concrete document. We also have obtained the agreement of Vietnam regarding the proposal on the simultaneous dismantling of the Subic naval base and the Cam Ranh material supply station.

In conclusion, Captain (Varisov) pointed out: From my own observations and conversations with friends, I would like to say that the Vietnamese side agrees with and supports us without reservations regarding the solution of this question.

Australian Communists Visit USSR 26 Mar-4 Apr

PM0704155589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "At the Invitation of the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] A delegation of workers from the Association for the Unity of Australian Communists headed by its national secretary W. Pritchard was in the Soviet Union from 26 March through 4 April at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. It showed great interest in being familiarized with the progress in implementing political and economic reform in the USSR and with the activity of the CPSU under conditions of restructuring.

The delegation was received at the CPSU Central Committee International Department and Party Construction and Cadre Work Department. The Australian communists had meetings and conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Social Sciences Institute, USSR Academy of Sciences institutes, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and the USSR Youth Organizations Committee. The delegation took a trip to Odessa and visited industrial and agricultural enterprises, educational establishments, and cultural institutes. The delegation members expressed a high opinion of Soviet people's ever-increasing activeness in social life.

Near East & South Asia

'Propaganda' on Su-24 Sales to Libya Decried

PM0704160189 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Correspondent G. Charodeyev report: "Explanations Given"]

[Text] The IZVESTIYA teletype room has received a telegram from AFP in Washington:

"Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir, who is in the United States on an official visit, has said he is concerned by reports that the Soviet Union has supplied Libya with fighter aircraft with a range that would make it possible to reach Israeli territory. These reports have been published in the American press, citing government sources. According to them, it is a question of 15 variable geometry fighter-bombers. The American intelligence services have been able to trace six of these aircraft, which, it transpires, were transported in kit form on board an An-22 from Novosibirsk to one of the Libyan bases."

The same thing has been reported by THE WASHINGTON POST, BBC Radio, and dozens of other major publications in Western Europe and the United States.

Your IZVESTIYA correspondent called the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration and asked them to comment on the AFP report. He received this response:

"Under some earlier contracts, the Soviet Union has supplied Libya with several Su-24 aircraft. It is an aircraft which, by virtue of its combat potential, is intended for performing tasks at close distances and is not capable of carrying out strategic tasks. What is more, in terms of range it is inferior to aircraft that were supplied to Libya several years ago. Therefore, the supplying of these aircraft does not signify a buildup of arms in quantitative or qualitative parameters and cannot alter the general correlation of forces in the region. One cannot help but notice that this propaganda campaign surrounding the 'Libyan bombers' has coincided with the arrival of Israeli Prime Minister Y. Shamir in Washington. The 'Libyan threat' is clearly intended to distract attention from what is impeding real progress in the task of a Near East settlement.

"The Soviet Union does not conceal its concern regarding the continuing arms race in the Near East. We are in favor of the level of military confrontation there being reduced. Specific ideas on this matter were expressed by Soviet Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze during his visit to the Near and Middle East in February this year. These problems must be resolved—and resolved seriously, through negotiation. Resorting to propaganda exercises in this matter is not the path that should be taken in this explosive region of the globe."

Gerasimov Urges U.S. Not To Miss Mideast Chance

TA0704100489 Jerusalem THE JERUSALEM POST in English 7 Apr 89 pp 1, 20

[Report by London-based correspondent David Horowitz]

[Text] An excellent opportunity exists at present for the international community to help resolve the Middle East conflict, Gennadiy Gerasimov, the chief Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, told THE JERUSALEM POST yesterday. But that opportunity might be wasted if the new U.S. Administration takes too long to formulate its policies, he warned.

Gerasimov, accompanying Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev on his two-day visit here, said that the improved climate of international relations has provided "a better opportunity for settlement of the Middle East conflict."

While the U.S. is a key player in the region, and is in a position to wield considerable influence over Israel, he said, the Soviets too had a part to play.

"We must solve this question together, and solve it (through) an international conference."

Gorbachev fully understands U.S. President George Bush's need for "time to study foreign policy," he added. "But we don't want this pause to become an interval."

Gerasimov said the Soviets would be willing to restore ties with Israel once a settlement process is begun.

"We are ready to re-establish relations but, and it's a big but, in the context of an overall Middle East settlement," he said.

Shevardnadze, Bhutto Envoy Discuss Afghanistan

LD0804122789 Moscow TASS in English 1214 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze received Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's special envoy, Prosecutor General Yahya Bakhtiar Saturday.

The envoy conveyed Bhutto's message to Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov.

The sides largely discussed matters of Afghan settlement. Shevardnadze noted the Soviet Union's strict fulfillment of its obligations under the Geneva accords, and spoke in detail about new Soviet initiatives on Afghanistan aimed at immediately ending the bloodshed and peacefully solving the conflict in that country.

The attention of the Pakistani envoy was drawn to Pakistan's violation of its commitments taken in Geneva, and to the growing Pakistani interference in Afghan affairs.

Shevardnadze said that Pakistan's aggressive actions against Afghanistan are evoking serious concern of the Soviet Union. They are also complicating the solution of the difficult problem and are fraught with unpredictable consequences for the destinies of peace and security in the whole of southwest Asia.

The conversation also covered some issues of Soviet-Pakistani relations. The Soviet side pointed out that the strict fulfillment by Pakistan of its commitments under the Geneva accords and its renunciation of interference in Afghan affairs would promote in many respects the beginning of a new stage in Soviet-Pakistani relations.

Bakhtiar said that the considerations and assessments of the Soviet side will be brought to the notice of the Pakistani prime minister.

The sides also discussed the work of the United Nations International Court of Justice.

Central Asian Republics Delegation in Kabul

LD1004092189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0848 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Kabul, 10 April (TASS)— A Soviet Central Asian republics delegation, from the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], Turkmen SSR, and Uzbek SSR, arrived on a visit to the Afghan capital today at the invitation of the leadership of the Republic of Afghanistan.

The envoys of the Soviet republics will hold talks with Afghan officials on a broad range of issues, including ways of strengthening and deepening direct ties between the Soviet Central Asian republics and various provinces of Afghanistan.

The delegation was met at Kabul international airport by Sarwar Mangal, deputy chairman of the Afghan Council of Ministers, Ahmad Lamar, chief of the main administration for direct ties of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Afghanistan, and by other officials. Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister and USSR ambassador to the Republic of Afghanistan, was present at the welcoming ceremony.

All Main Roads to Jalalabad Said Cut Off

LD0904210489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 9 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Just this moment we received, via satellite, a report by Aleksandr Shkirando, our correspondent in Afghanistan, from Nangarhar Province. [video shows Shkirando in a studio, a "Betacam" television camera on his desk] Before starting a series of reports from Jalalabad, the province's administrative center, our crew would like to apologize for the poor quality, possibly, in certain parts. This was caused by the fact we had to use a camera we had borrowed from our Afghan colleagues, and that camera was not in altogether good working order. Our camera was hit by a bullet during an attack on our helicopter while we were approaching Jalalabad. [Shkirando points to a hole in the camera housing]

That was the first concrete sign of the war being waged here. It started on 6 March, and according to the plan of the Afghan armed opposition that has formed its so-called transitional government in Pakistan, it was to have finished in a couple of days by seizing Jalalabad. A specific day for President Sebghatullah Mujadeddi and his cabinet to enter the town had been announced. [video of a helicopter landing, destroyed houses, and vehicles]

This, however, has not happened and, first of all, because the Afghan people, including Jalalabad residents, did not want that. What we saw there, though, could hardly be described as a town. We did not find, during filming, a single house or shop that had been left intact. Even these age-old trees could not withstand powerful explosions. [video of damaged trees]

While we were shooting this footage, more than a thousand shells and mines were fired by the extremists on the town. Old men and children were mowed down near us. By such acts of vandalism have the so-called fighters for the faith marked the beginning of the Muslim Ramadan holiday, during which, as the Koran says, the Muslims must subdue their excesses. [video shows corpse, wounded man]

[Begin recording] [Lieutenant-Colonel Ziyarat Gol, in vernacular fading into Russian translation] The situation in Jalalabad and around it remains very complex. Having failed to gain a military victory, the extremists are trying to take the town by starvation. On one hand, mines and shells, which are being delivered near Jalalabad from Pakistan continuously, are falling on peaceful areas like hail, day and night. On the other hand, the extremists are stepping up an economic blocade. All the main roads to the town have been cut off. In connection with this, the food problem has become very acute. Nevertheless, neither the fear nor the panic that the opposition leaders have counted upon are in evidence in the town. On the contary, the complexity of the situation has consolidated even stronger all the defenders of the town. The Pakistani military and leaders of the irreconcilable opposition should know that, regardless of any pressure or shellings, we will never surrender Jalalabad. [video shows Ziyarat Gol being interviewed on a moving armed personnel carrier; outskirts of Jalalabad also shown] [end recording]

Afghan Rebel Attacks in Khowst, Ghazni, Sarowbi

LD0904175289 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1457 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Kabul, 9 April. (TASS)—Over the last 24 hours formations of the irreconcilable opposition have undertaken a large-scale advance on Khowst District. According to reports, the mujahidin are led by two Pakistani

military advisors from the Punjab: Mali Khan and Janbaz Shah. In spite of heavy enemy fire, government units are holding their positions. Information on the sides' losses has not been received.

The "irreconcilables" have subjected residential districts and security posts in Ghazni to missile and mortar bombardment; nine civilians have been killed and 48 injured. Two government troops have been killed and six wounded.

The detachments of the armed opposition leading the advance on the administrative center of Nangarhar Province, Jalalabad city, today suffered 195 dead and more than 140 wounded. This is a result of ground attacks by the Afghan air force. Afghan Army subdivisions have repulsed the mujahidin advance on security posts in Sarowbi District on a sector of the Kabul-Jalalabad Highway, killing 54 and wounding about 40 enemies of the regime.

The Republic of Afghanistan's Armed Forces suffered five men wounded in the skirmishes. In a counterattack, government troops forced the "irreconcilables" out of their forward firing positions and destroyed a considerable amount of weapons and ammunition.

In the past 24 hours an operation has been carried out to eliminate groups of terrorists engaged in subversion and robbery on the Mazar-e Sharif to Samangan Highway.

The Foreign Ministry of the Republic of Afghanistan has sent three more notes to the United Nations Good Offices Mission, citing fresh instances of Pakistan's violation of the Geneva accords and of its gross interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs.

7,000 Mujahidin Said Killed Since 6 Mar

LD0904074289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Excerpt] The Afghan Army has fended off several fresh attacks by the armed opposition on the city of Jalalabad. (Muhammad Amani), a government spokesman, reported that in the last 24 hours of fighting, the irreconcilable formations lost 78 people, with 55 people injured. The mujahidin have lost a total of over 7,000 killed since 6 March, when the offensive on Jalalabad began. [passage omitted]

Afghan Rebels Sell Weapons to Sikh Extremists

LD0704155389 Moscow TASS in English 1254 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] New Delhi March 7 TASS—By TASS Correspondent Aleksey Vinogradov:

Details of the Afghan armed opposition's contacts with Sikh terrorists endeavouring to split Punjab away from India and to set up a "State of Khalistan", as well as with separatists in the Indian states of Jammu and Kashmir have been made public here.

P Chidambaram, the Indian state minister of home affairs, told Parliament that it was learned for sure that there were direct contacts between the Afghan "irreconcilable opposition" and Sikh separatists in Britain in 1985 and then in the United States in 1986. They had talks, among other things, on the sale to Sikh groupings of portable "Stinger" anti-aircraft missiles, supplied to the Afghan opposition by the United States.

These contacts are continuing today, too. Representatives of the "irreconcilable opposition" were present last month at a meeting called in London by Jagjit Singh Chauhan, the self-styled "president of Khalistan." Another meeting in London, held last October, was attended by Sikh separatists, representatives of the "irreconcilable opposition" and champions of the so-called "Front of National Liberation of Kashmir".

Information has also appeared in the Indian press that ringleaders of the Afghan opposition were making preparations to dispatch their combatants to India in support of Punjab underground groupings, which had suffered heavy losses in recent months in the course of operations carried out by Indian security troops.

There is evidence showing who is behind these contacts, who is knocking together a kind of alliance of different terrorist groups. P. Chidambaram said it was known for certain that the "irreconcilable opposition" and the Sikh combatants were supported by the Pakistani military intelligence. "Contacts between them can only be reliable only if they are made through its channels", he said.

Problems Facing UN in Afghanistan Viewed

18070203 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[V. Snegirev report: "What Can the 'Blue Berets' Do?"]

[Text] Kabul April—Hardly a day passes without news coming out of Nangarhar Province, where fierce fighting continues between government troops and detachments of the opposition blockading Jalalabad, of the involvement of Pakistanis in the siege of the city. Sometimes military helicopters bearing the markings of that country land at the positions of the mujahidin and unload what is obviously not lemonade. Sometimes a column of army trucks painted with suitable camouflage delivers batches of weapons and ammunition to the rebels. It is known that the rears of the "irreconcilable" are being supplied by the 11th and 18th divisions of the Pakistani army and that these operations are being handled by the Pakistani

counterintelligence officer Lt Col Mahbub Shah. Moreover, Pakistani malishi [tribal militia] and military advisors are playing a significant role in the combat actions at Jalalabad.

In short, if this is not aggression then it is at least a gross and impermissible interference in the internal affairs of a neighboring country. Terrorists of various kinds are still being sheltered in the numerous training camps and bases on Pakistani territory, from intelligence people and saboteurs to ordinary infantrymen—the "cannon fodder" that is subsequently hurled at Jalalabad.

All these things are facts. They cannot be denied. And each of them testifies to Pakistan's gross violation of the Geneva accords, which impose restraint from armed intervention, subversive actions and any act of military, political or economic interference in the internal affairs of the other country, and prohibit the training, arming or financing of mercenaries on their own territories for the purpose of engaging in hostile actions against the other side.

In its notes and official representations the Afghan Foreign Ministry has repeatedly drawn attention to Pakistan's disregard for the Geneva accords. The content of a note sent by the Afghan president Najibullah to the UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar was recently made public, in which the Afghan leader again drew attention to Pakistan's aggressive political course and the unprecedented increase in military tension in the region, and asked that urgent steps be taken, in particular the organization of strict UN inspections in the border regions. In Najibullah's opinion, the operations groups of the UN observer mission now based in Kabul and Islamabad could fulfill this role.

The UN goodwill mission to Afghanistan and Pakistan set up under the Geneva accords was sent to the Middle East in April last year with three tasks. The observers in the blue berets were, first, to monitor observance of the procedure for the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Second, they were to monitor noninterference in the internal affairs of the two countries. And third, they were to help in the repatriation of Afghan refugees. With regard to fulfillment of the first task, according to a public statement by the leader of the mission, Finnish General R. Helminen, no problems had arisen with the UN observers here. But what are the 40 officers representing ten states doing today?

In Kabul the UN observers' office can be made out from a distance by the blue flag on its high pole. Like all other UN facilities, the villa in the privileged quarter of the capital has been fortified with sandbags up as high as its roof. It seems that questions of insuring personal safety are being given priority here. I was received by three colonels: A. Gurun from Nepal, A. Totoko from Fiji and G. Kirk from Ireland. At the start of the conversation these officials had to offer an immediate explanation: they could answer any questions except those of a political nature.

"At this time," A. Gurun said, "our basic duty is to monitor noninterference by Afghanistan and Pakistan in each other's internal affairs."

"And what can be said on this score?"

"Both sides have submitted numerous complaints to us. We are obliged to look into each case but up to now we have been able to deal with only three claims. The lack of guarantees of safety is hampering access to the necessary information."

"Where are the UN officers deployed today?"

"We have 20 men in Kabul and the same number in Jalalabad. The Pakistan part of the UN observer mission has observation posts in Peshawar and Quetta."

"And what is stopping you from moving closer to the border, say a point at Towr Kham? Then it would be much easier obtain the necessary information."

"It is too dangerous. Moreover you must remember that our possibilities are limited; we are not a peacekeeping force."

"The Afghan side is citing numerous instances of military involvement in combat actions on territory in Nangarhar province by Pakistani servicemen. What can you say about this?"

"We have been unable to reach any conclusions based on such claims."

"How is the part of your mission deployed in Pakistan dealing with claims about the presence there of a large number of training centers and bases for the Afghan armed opposition?"

"We have heard of such cases but are unable to confirm them."

"Have there been cases in which any of your lives have been threatened?"

"No, there have been no such cases. During the pullout of the Soviet troops we were given maximum cooperation and assistance. Now, working in Kabul, we are not encountering any obstacles from Afghan officials."

"When does your mandate expire?"

"On 15 November 1989. Only the Security Council can extend it."

I have no doubts about the personal bravery and honesty of these people, who before the Middle East have carried out their noble mission in Lebanon and the Congo, on the Golan Heights and in the Sinai. But can we agree with them that they have done everything possible to carry out their monitoring functions in observance of the Geneva accords? Can the UN role in today's situation be considered adequate when the fire of the conflict is becoming increasingly brighter? Kabul is suggesting that the "blue berets" set up observation posts in a whole series of places on the Afghan-Pakistani border, and for its part is promising to create all possible guarantees of safety. Western correspondents report that Islamabad is against this. The ball is in the UN's court.

Commentator Hopes for U.S. Withdrawal From Gulf
NC0904084389 Moscow in Persian to Iran
1100 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Georgiy Vasiliyev commentary: "The Fields of Good Understanding Are Expanding"]

[Text] At a banquet held in honor of Iranian Foreign Minister 'Ali Akbar Velayati in the Kremlin in Moscow, Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev expressed satisfaction over the state of bilateral ties and pointed to the growing good understanding and the growing concordance of views between the Soviet Union and Iran on important issues that embrace both countries' interests.

The issue of peace and security in the Persian Gulf is one of the issues to which special attention is paid in Moscow and Tehran. The Soviet Union has struggled persistently toward the normalization of the situation in that region. Even during the period of war activities between Iran and Iraq, Moscow understood the need to ensure free navigation in the Persian Gulf and, consequently, proposed that a UN navy be formed which would replace all of the navies from non-littoral countries that were maintaining a presence in the Persian Gulf. When putting forth this proposal, the Soviet Union bore in mind the fact that armed forces under the control of the United Nations have and continue to be used in many parts of the world for the purpose of easing tensions. The Soviet Union also noted that under the aegis of the UN forces' activities, the true conditions for the reconciliation of the belligerent sides were created.

Unfortunately, the Soviet Union's proposal was not accepted at that time. However, now that the process of terminating the Iran-Iraq war is continuing with practical steps, and now that specific talks for the final solution of the two countries' differences have started on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 598, the Soviet Union again proposes that all warships belonging to non-littoral countries leave the Persian Gulf.

This proposal was one of the topics which the Soviet and Iranian foreign ministers discussed during their talks in Moscow last week. One can emphasize with full satisfaction that the Iranian side also expressed its views in favor of the immediate withdrawal of non-littoral forces from the Persian Gulf.

Our commentator then writes: The stand of many of the world's countries on this conforms with that of our two countries'. For example, an international seminar on problems related to converting the Indian Ocean into an area of peace was held in Sochi, in the Soviet Union, recently under UN auspices. During this seminar, the participants, who represented around 50 countries, supported the proposal calling for the withdrawal of foreign ships from the Persian Gulf. They pointed out that this will help turn the Persian Gulf into an area of peace.

However, Washington—which has not cooperated within the framework of the UN Special Committee on the Indian Ocean—continues to insist on maintaining its military presence in the Persian Gulf. We know that the United States has not only concentrated its naval task force, comprised of a warship, several destroyers, other ships and a group of Marines, in the Persian Gulf, but it also has formed a special naval operations command there, which falls directly under the Centcom.

An interesting point is that (Charles Mickeling), former high-ranking U.S. State Department official, said, when commenting on the increased U.S. strength in the Persian gulf: When you have such a force, the temptation to use it arises. This forecast materialized in the worst possible way when the U.S. Navy destroyed several Iranian oil platforms in the Persian Gulf and when the "USS Vincennes" downed an Iranian passenger plane with a missile, killing approximately 300 innocent people.

The United States originally justified its military presence in the Persian Gulf on the pretext of the Iran-Iraq war. However, even though more than 6 months have passed since the Iran-Iraq cease-fire agreement, Washington continues to preserve the presence of its navy in that area and continues to prevent the situation from returning to normal there. This U.S. militaristic policy is criticized everywhere, and primarily in the littoral Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean countries. Mrs (Mula Mula), Tanzanian representative to the United Nations, who participated in the international seminar in Sochi, described as intolerable the U.S. acts that are preventing the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf from being converted into areas of peace. She pointed out that peace-loving countries throughout the world, and not only countries in this vast region, support turning this vast area into one of peace.

It is hoped that the United States, which is a permanent Security Council member and one of the authors of Resolution 598, will review its nonconstructive stand on the withdrawal of non-littoral navies from the Persian Gulf. This will help turn this area into one of peace.

Our commentator, Georgiy Vasiliyev, concludes: I am certain that further understanding and agreement of views on important issues between the Soviet Union and Iran will encourage Washington to take such a constructive step.

U.S. Uses Gulf War as Pretext for Navy Presence

NC0704171289 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Commentary from "On the Waves of Radio Moscow" weekly feature, including recorded remarks by Aleksandr Batev in Russian with superimposed Persian translation; questions are announcer-read]

[Text] During the recent Soviet-Iranian talks, great attention was paid to ways of completely overcoming the differences between Iran and Iraq. The two parties also pointed to the need for the immediate withdrawal of the navies of non-littoral countries from the Persian Gulf. The Soviet Union and Iran believe that this will help toward the establishment of regional peace.

It appears that steps are being taken to this effect. REUTER reports that since the declaration of the cease-fire, the U.S. Administration has carried out a considerable reduction of its naval forces in the Persian Gulf. Out of the 14 warships stationed in the Persian Gulf, 4 have been withdrawn. Nevertheless, the mass media have not paid much attention to this. We asked our analyst Aleksandr Batev to discuss the reasons for this.

[Begin Batev recording] This is simply because this reduction does not in practice alter anything in the Persian Gulf. I recall that immediately after the cease-fire in the Iran-Iraq war, the NATO allies of the United States either drastically reduced their navies in the Persian Gulf, or completely withdrew them. This was because attacks on oil tankers in international waters had almost ceased and there was no longer any need for the presence of their ships. Only the U.S. Administration did not seem to be in a rush to reduce its immense naval presence, sometimes reaching 30 ships. Thus, this indirectly proved the correctness of the suspicion that Washington was using the Iran-Iraq war as a pretext to increase its military presence in the region. The last doubts were removed when a spokesman for the U.S. Navy in Bahrain announced the withdrawal of four warships from the Persian Gulf and warned: We do not want it to be thought that we are leaving the Persian Gulf. We are only adjusting to the threat level in the Persian Gulf. [end recording]

[Announcer] But now, at a time when calm prevails on the Iran-Iraq front and the two sides are negotiating for a final solution to their conflict, what threats can one be speaking of? Moreover, throughout the entire period since the cease-fire was established there have been no attacks on ships.

[Begin Batev recording] Washington claims that so long as Iran and Iraq have not signed a peace treaty, navigation in the Gulf is threatened. It should be pointed out, however, that this allegation is only a pretext because, as stated by Pentagon spokesmen, once this treaty is signed between Iran and Iraq, the U.S. Administration will, at any rate, keep about seven of its warships in the Persian Gulf; and these are in addition to the aircraft carrier fleet, consisting of 10 warships, presently patrolling the Gulf of Oman adjacent to the Persian Gulf. [end recording]

[Announcer] On what pretext will they justify the presence of these ships?

[Begin Batev recording] It may sound strange, but the presence of these warships is linked with improvement of the situation in the region and with the strengthening of goodneighborly relations and cooperation. The U.S. Administration is primarily thinking of the beginning of a rapprochment between the Soviet Union and Iran, and thinks that this rapprochement should be on a par with the rapprochement with Washington. Anyone with common sense is stunned by the logic of some of Washington's statesmen. When the limited Soviet contingents were in Afghanistan, they spoke about the increased Soviet presence in the region. But now that the Soviet contingents have left Afghan territory and the Soviet Union's relations with regional countries, especially Iran, are improving, Washington is once again babbling about the need to prevent Soviet infiltration in the region. All these babblings, like the presence of the U.S. Navy in the Persian Gulf, actually have their roots in the cold war era. But this era is over.

I hope that the U.S. Administration does not want to appear in the eyes of the world to be the enemy of the idea of turning the Persian Gulf into a region of peace, goodneighborly relations, and cooperation. The day will come when it will inevitably have to decide on a complete withdrawal of its Navy from the Persian Gulf. [end recording]

Montazeri Resignation Reveals New 'Instability'

NC0804114389 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1100 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Andrey Krasnov commentary]

[Text] Dear friends: The Iranian mass media has informed us that Ayatollah Montazeri, Imam Khomeyni's official successor, has resigned from this position. In Iran, parts of the letters exchanged between Khomeyni and Montazeri were published. The imam's successor stated that he lacks the ability to tolerate the heavy burden of the country's supreme leadership and wants to return to the simple life of a theologian. Andrey Krasnov, Soviet analyst on Middle Eastern affairs, writes:

Ayatollah Montazeri's resignation may appear unexpected only at first glance. However, actually the first sign of this situation was apparent as far back as 1986 when, at the initiative of the Information Ministry, Montazeri's son-in-law, Mehdi Hashemi, and about 200 of his colleagues and co-strugglers were arrested. The Iranian press reported that they were accused of murder, robbery, the illegal possession of arms and confidential documents, and of involvement in illegal acts. In December 1986, Mehdi Hashemi, who was in charge of the world Islamic movement and in charge of exporting the islamic revolution, confessed to involvement in murder, to the illegal possession of arms, and to cooperation with the shah's (?hostile) police. He also revealed that the office of Ayatollah Montazeri—who was not at all aware of what was going on—was the major area of his activities and that he had exploited his relative's trust. But at that time Montazeri was able to survive this scandal and was not officially reprimanded, even though [words indistinct] malicious rumors were spread about him aimed at defaming respectable Muslims.

At that time Imam Khomeyni supported his successor and described him as a true treasure, also condemning efforts to question the credibility of his legal successor.

Naturally, the questions that arise are: What has changed now? Why has the imam accepted Montazeri's resignation? Let us see what the facts show.

At the onset of his political activities, Ayatollah Montazeri, the 66-year old religious and political dignitary, showed himself to be a supporter of the idea of exporting the Islamic revolution and of fundamentalist and extremist reforms in domestic policy. However, from early 1985 on, the nature and tone of his remarks changed and became more moderate. Montazeri began to express more tolerance and compatibility. He strongly criticized the government and the Islamic Revolutionary Guards for limiting the individual and political freedoms of Iranian citizens. He opposed officials' harsh treatment of arrested opponents of the regime and stated that the liberals of Iran should play a serious role in the country's affairs.

Montazeri may be considered the most outstanding recent critic of extremism which, as he put it, has made foreigners see Iran as a country of murderers. It was in view of such remarks that the high-ranking government echelon's approach to him became harsher and harsher. Many analysts believe that it was probably Montazeri who supported improving Iran's relations with the West. As is known, in the middle of last year Tehran started diligent efforts to re-establish its relations with the West and scored spectacular successes in this. In June 1988, Iran renewed its relations with France. In December of the same year, diplomatic relations with Great Britain were resumed and Iran's political and economic contacts with Italy, the FRG, Canada, and Japan increased in a notworthy way. It was even said that Iran-U.S. relations were also strengthening. The existing view is that it was Montazeri who was the major supporter of this line in the Iranian leadership's foreign policy.

However, in February 1989, as a result of Imam Khomeyni's decree on killing Salman Rushdie, the British author who according to Khomeyni had insulted Islam, the process of normalizing relations between Iran and the developed industrialized capitalist countries was upset and the Iranian revolution drawn back to the position of irreconcilability that characterized its early years.

Under such conditions, Montazeri's policy, which was aimed at cooperation with the West and reconciliation with liberals inside the country, became an unacceptable one. Apparently, Imam Khomeyni, who has become the founder of the new wave of Islamic revolutionary tendenices, persuaded his successor to resign from his position. It is also probable that Ayatollah Montazeri's resignation speaks of the existence of tensions in the succession issue among the leadership. At any rate, it will be proven in the near future whether this is true or false. However, today it is clear that Iran has entered a new phase of turbulent political instability.

Fundamentalist Role in Iran Power Struggle Noted

NC0804141189 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Ceremonies have been held to introduce new religious scholars in six Iranian religious centers. The Iranian media report that these ceremonies were aimed at boosting the morale of fundamentalism. Recently, high-ranking theological schools have been strongly criticized for having to some extent given up fundamentalist traditions. For example, it has even been pointed out that a flexible attitude can be seen on the part of religious circles to the overt opponents of revolution and Islam.

It appears that the fact that efforts to boost the morale of fundamentalism have coincided with the resignation of a number of high-ranking dignitaries of Iranian society is not accidental. Undoubtedly, Ayatollah Montazeri—who is no longer regarded as the official successor of Khomeyni—was the most eminent of these officials. Deputy Foreign Minister Larijani and Ambassador Mahallati, Iran's envoy to the United Nations, had resigned a short while before this.

What made these senior officials resign at such an important time for the couantry? Observers believe that Ayatollah Montazeri's resignation was the zenith of the political power struggle among various groups within the government. As you know, in recent months Montazeri had repeatedly criticized some of the ruling clerical representatives for their mistakes and extremism, and

had stated that these actions had led to (?Iran's) international isolation. He had said that Iran had been portrayed in the eyes of foreigners as a country of murderers. However, there are [words indistinct] in his remarks. After all, the [words indistinct] continue with political prisoners in prisons, and [words indistinct] to confess to past mistakes and call both on forces at home and abroad to participate in the vital task of rehabilitating the country's economy.

(?Undoubtedly) Mahallati, Larijani, and other Iranian officials who are the targets of wrath agreed with Ayatollah Montazeri's views to a certain extent. Both the deputy foreign minister and the Iranian ambassador to the United Nations clearly saw the international repercussions of the course of events in their country, and well understood the fact that [words indistinct] existed. They considered [word indistinct], (?flexibility), and cooperation to be the major tools needed to revive the country—a country that has suffered greatly from an 8-year war and which is facing inflation, unemployment, poverty, and drug addiction.

The exit of the above-mentioned Iranian officials from the (?political scene) raises the question of what the outlook for Iran's future development will be. We believe that for the time being answering [words indistinct], but naturally conflict and irreconcilability are not the best methods for solving the problems Iran is facing.

Procurator General Meets PDRY Counterpart

LD0404133389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 4 Apr 89

[Text] USSR Procurator General Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev is on an official visit to People's Democratic Republic of Yemen [PDRY]. Our Aden correspondent reports:

[A. Murashkin] USSR Procurator General Comrade Sukharev is chairman of the board of the USSR-PDRY Friendship Society. During a meeting between Aleksandr Yakovlevich Sukharev and PDRY Public Prosecutor Khalid 'Umar ba Junayd there was discussion of a draft agreement on cooperation between the procuracies general of their countries.

Comrade Sukharev also took part in a Soviet-Yemeni friendship meeting held at one of the largest instances of bilateral economic cooperation, a thermal power station near the capital of the republic. Our country's procurator general had a number of meetings with the leadership of the party and government of the PDRY, and with prominent public figures of the republic. [video shows Sukharev at talks and meetings]

Sub-Saharan Africa

Angola's Dos Santos, Adamishin Discuss Namibia

LD0704220189 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2105 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Luanda, 8 Apr (TASS)—On the eve of the extraordinary session of the joint commission observing the settlement in South-West Africa, in which the Soviet Union is participating as an observer, Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola [MPLA] Workers Party and president of the People's Republic of Angola, received A.L. Adamishin, USSR deputy foreign affairs minister here on Friday.

There was a substantive exchange of opinions on a number of current questions connected with the settlement in South-West Africa, including the situation in northern Namibia. They discovered a coincidence of Soviet and Angolan points of view on ways to unblock the explosive situation that has arisen, and noted the usefulness of constructive efforts by the UN and "Frontline" States of Africa, which are calling for the difficulties to be overcome that have arisen in the process of implementing the agreements that have been reached providing for the decolonization of Namibia and the establishment of peace in the region.

The Soviet Union and Angola decisively favor an immediate and unconditional cease-fire and the return of the settlement process in South-West Africa to its normal course, and strict observance of the agreements by all those involved, including South Africa.

'Group Interests' Must Not Block Namibia Peace

PM0704121389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 5

[B. Asoyan commentary under the general heading "UN Plan Under Threat"]

[Text] The renewed armed clashes between South-West African People's Organization (SWAPO) fighters and South African military servicemen have seriously exacerbated the situation in South-West Africa and jeopardized the implementation of the UN plan for giving independence to Namibia, which began on 1 April.

What has happened in northern Namibia is certainly regrettable, although it was apparently unavoidable. It is hard to imagine that implementation of the agreement—which had such a tortuous birth—on a settlement in Namibia will proceed smoothly. The enormous reserves of mistrust and enmity and the many years of orientation toward deceiving the opposition and drawing up options "for every eventuality" will continue to impede the normalization of the situation in this region for a long time to come.

The temptation to retain the advantage is still great. Some people are still naively confident that, in the dense bush, it is not so easy to discover who is right and who is guilty and that the blame for this or that conflict can be shifted onto the enemy. Nor can another factor be ignored—the vast quantity of arms, including the very latest weaponry, which has been accumulated there over the last 2 decades.

Probably another reason for the complication of the situation is that the participants in the conflict have still not fully grasped that now there are no enemies on the battlefield and that the battlefield itself should not exist; or that the agreement on Namibia represents a compromise under which there are no losers and no winners.

The leaders of the future independent Namibia must display wisdom and determination, suppress emotions, and concentrate all their energy on clearing the minefields of mistrust. After all, the whole world is watching the process of Namibia's transition to independence. Any attempt to gain one-sided advantages at the expense of the other side will not go unnoticed. It would simply be foolish to count on this.

And another thing, an attempt at an international solution to a regional conflict has been made in South-West Africa. Too many efforts and resources have been invested to make this agreement become reality. Undermining it would mean striking a blow against the new atmosphere of trust in the world.

This, without doubt, would complicate the process of improving the situation in other hotbeds of tension in southern Africa and ultimately slow the pace of steps to eliminate the main source of conflict in the region—the apartheid system.

Many problems await Namibia in the coming months. There is no doubt that as the general election date draws closer, the political struggle will become more bitter. There is a real possibility that interethnic contradictions will be exacerbated, and one cannot rule out the possibility of conflicts arising on racial grounds. Even now, one can see signs of a growth in extremist trends among the extreme right-wing circles of the white community, which reject UN Security Council Resolution 435 and are demanding that the apartheid system be retained in Namibia. Some figures could feel tempted to resort to arms again in order to prove that they are right. Many are predicting a mass exodus of whites if the situation gets out of control.

All these factors must be considered by Namibia's political leaders and by those countries which are connected in one way or another with the settlement of this conflict. Group interests cannot be allowed to stand in the way of Namibian independence. Everything must be done to ensure that those who died in the exchanges of fire in the first days of April are the last victims claimed by the war.

East Europe

Shevardnadze Visit to GDR Postponed Until 'Later'

LD1004111489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Under a reciprocal accord, the official friendly visit to the GDR by Comrade Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, has been postponed. The visit will take place later at a time acceptable to both sides.

Soviet-GDR Military Exercises To Begin 15 Apr

LD0804162789 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—It was officially announced here that a joint military exercise for upgrading combat ability as well as command-and-liaison functions of the Soviet contingent in East Germany and the East German Volksarmee will take place from 15 to 21 of April in the area of Treunbritzen, Jessen, Cottbus, Eisenhuettenstadt and Teupitz.

The exercise will involve land and air force units and task forces with the total number of personnel amounting to 18.5 thousand.

In conformity with the Stockholm Conference agreement, the GDR Government has invited observers from all the member-countries of the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe to attend the manoeuvres.

GDR Delegations Visit for 'Inter-Party' Contacts

Razumovskiy Receives Party Officials

LD3103223689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 31 Mar 89

[Text] In accordance with plans for inter-party contacts between the CPSU and Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SED), a delegation of SED party officials, headed by Brock, member of the SED Central Auditing Commission and head of the Trade Unions and Social Policy Department of the party's Central Committee, was in our country from 27-31 March. The delegation was familiarized with the experience of CPSU work to increase the activeness of the working people in decisions on tasks relating to social and economic development. The delegation was received by Razumovskiy, candidate member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Technological Group Tours Enterprises

PM0404113789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Mar 89 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Exchange of Experience"]

[Text] A delegation of party workers from the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] headed by K. Blessing, director of the SED Central Committee Machine Construction and Metallurgy Department, visited the Soviet Union 27-30 March in accordance with the plan for interparty ties between the CPSU and the SED. The delegation was familiarized with the CPSU's experience in leading the accelerated development and introduction of vital technologies in the sphere of electronics and modern computer equipment.

The German comrades had meetings and conversations at the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Department, the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee, and the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems, and visited a number of scientific institutions and enterprises.

West Europe

Reportage on Gorbachev Visit to Britain

Gorbachev's 6-7 Apr Meetings Viewed

PM0704145589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[Special Correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and A. Maslennikov dispatch: "Businesslike Style of Visit"]

[Text] Apr 6—"A warm reception in the Siberian cold," was how one British television commentator described M.S. Gorbachev's meeting at London's Heathrow Airport. There was good reason to begin with a reference to the weather. Few people here can remember such an April, with rain mixed with snow and such a biting cold wind. "With weather like this, how do the British manage to look so young?" M.S. Gorbachev asked Margaret Thatcher, and the latter smiled.

In fact, it was not today but last night that the serious exchange of opinions on the most vital problems of world politics began between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher. En route to the Soviet Embassy, which is serving as the Soviet leader's residence, M. Thatcher congratulated M.S. Gorbachev on the well organized withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Afghanistan, which was carried out entirely according to schedule, and expressed her high assessment of the recent elections of USSR people's deputies in the Soviet Union. The two leaders exchanged opinions on events in Namibia. M. Thatcher gave her impressions of her recent trip to Africa, as did M.S. Gorbachev of his trip to Cuba.

This morning talks began at 10 Downing Street, the official residence of prime ministers since 1735.

Here is what the British press is writing about the visit. In an editorial with the Dickensian title "Great Expectations," the DAILY TELEGRAPH expresses the general opinion of the majority of observers: "A very great deal has been done recently to develop Soviet-British relations. But the more that is done in that area, the greater our appetite for the future. The British style is a businesslike style. And in giving M.S. Gorbachev a cordial reception, we recall that it is this businesslike style that should open up new prospects in Soviet-British cooperation, and that actions are needed—as many as possible."

But the British would not be the British if they all thought the same way. That is why the British press today offers a broad range of different opinions. THE GUARDIAN believes that the main question in the discussions between the two leaders will be disarmament and that this may cause sharp disagreements, particularly on the problem of modernizing nuclear forces. THE INDEPENDENT's editorial expresses the opinion that Britain should help the USSR in the implementation of its reforms "without, of course, relaxing its own vigilance."

A number of newspapers note that Downing Street is apprehensive about the far-reaching new Soviet proposals, which could "undermine NATO," that is, the new peace initiatives particularly in the European disarmament sphere, and thus "awaits with trepidation" the Soviet leader's speech at the Guildhall tomorrow. THE INDEPENDENT expresses confidence that "one of the British side's main concerns at all the talks will be questions of trade."

More than 150 British MP's have signed a draft motion welcoming M.S. Gorbachev's arrival. As the legislators stress, the Soviet leader's visit is "a positive step in the direction of peace and friendship between the peoples of Great Britain and the Soviet Union." This resolution was moved by Labour MP Eric Heffer and may be termed a counterbalance to the statement "Human Rights in the Soviet Union," which appeared in yesterday's THE TIMES. This was signed by parliamentarians who claim that "basic human rights guaranteed by international law continue to be violated in the Soviet Union." This statement has given rise to many commentaries here, including references to the nonobservance of human rights in Britain, especially in Northern Ireland.

After the morning meeting at Downing Street, the Soviet leader went to Westminster Abbey.

Today M.S. Gorbachev visited the Case Communications plant in Watford. Recently this firm has concentrated on the design and production of electronic and information technology systems that make it possible to automate the preparation and transfer of data from various computers in different parts of the world and also enables them to be linked in a single network by telephone and telex lines. The use of systems of this kind makes it possible to integrate different data banks in an integrated system that works over any distance. At present the Watford plant uses around 2,000 computer systems of various kinds. The high level of production organization enables the firm to produce complex apparatuses within 4-6 weeks of receipt of an order.

M.S. Gorbachev had a meeting with N. Kinnock, leader of the British Labour Party. The meeting caused great interest here. The Labour Party is the most influential opposition force in Britain. Labour MP's hold 229 of the 650 parliamentary seats. In the foreign policy sphere they actively advocate nuclear disarmament and support the Soviet proposals on the complete elimination of

nuclear weapons. In recent years Kinnock has increased his international standing, primarily within the Socialist International, where he plays a prominent role.

Next the Soviet leader visited Lancaster House—one of London's most beautiful buildings. It is said that after Queen Victoria had taken up residence at Buckingham Palace she visited Lancaster House and remarked: "We have come to your palace from our own humble abode." Leading British business representatives were invited to the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev there.

At the meeting, M.S. Gorbachev advocated the active development of trade and economic relations between our countries, especially since we have bottlenecks in this area and the target of increasing commodity exchange between our countries by 40 percent has not yet been achieved.

The consistent implementation by interested organizations in the two countries of the existing program for the development of economic and industrial cooperation between the USSR and Britain for the period 1986-1990 is a real basis for ensuring the further growth of Soviet-British trade and establishing diverse forms of mutually beneficial business links. The forms of economic cooperation are becoming increasingly diverse. A number of joint ventures have already been created, three of them in Britain. Around 30 projects that could be the object of joint entrepreneurial activity are at various stages of development. It must be said here that our ministries must also abandon the bureaucratic methods British businessmen complain about.

The strenuous first day of the Soviet-British meeting ended in the evening with an official banquet. M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher exchanged speeches. The characteristic feature was that there were no oral translations of the speeches; written translations had already been placed on the tables. Every minute of the meeting is being used thriftily. That is its businesslike style.

Gorbachev Meets British CP Leaders

LD0704185689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1658 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] London, 7 Apr (TASS)—This morning M.S. Gorbachev and A.N. Yakovlev chatted at the Soviet Embassy with G. McLennan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain [CPGB], and G. Pocock, member of the Political Committee of the Executive Committee of the CPGB.

M.S. Gorbachev briefly described the significance of the Soviet-British summit for the further development of relations between the two countries and for the European peace process. The community of views of the CPSU and the CPGB on matters of nuclear disarmament was stressed once again. G. McLennan expressed, on behalf of the party, full support for the policy of restructuring in the USSR.

Certain topical points of an international nature were touched upon, including a Namibia settlement.

The interlocutors agreed on invigoration of interparty contacts, and noted how a tendency of mutual understanding and rapprochement has grown up within the workers' movement and among the forces of the left. V.M. Falin and L.M. Zamyatin took part in the meeting.

Gorbachev Meets Business Leaders

LD0704180689 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 7 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the government Lancaster House mansion, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had a meeting with leading representatives of the British business world, including the heads of firms regularly trading with the Soviet Union. The initiators of the meeting were Lord Young, minister for trade and industry, and Trevor Holdsworth, president of the Confederation of British Industry. Taking part in the meeting were Comrades Shevardnadze and Yakovlev, and Comrade Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The British businessmen welcome the London meeting of the leaders of the two countries, seeing in it a new step toward expanding economic cooperation with the Soviet Union and imparting greater dynamism to it. It was noted during the conversation that since a new agreement was signed in this sphere 2 years ago, at the meeting of the two leaders in Moscow, Anglo-Soviet business links have been noticeably strengthened, and by 1990 they will increase by 40 percent, reaching a volume of R2.5 billion.

The representatives of British industry showed great interest in the Soviet market and in new business links with their Soviet partners. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's talks with British business circles was constructive in character and aimed at widening the forms and speeding up the development of commercial and economic cooperation between the two countries. [video shows Lancaster House and meeting.]

Gorbachev on 'Common European Home'

PM0704144389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Special correspondents A. Krivopalov and M. Sturua dispatch: "No. 10 Downing Street: Morning and Evening"]

[Excerpt] London—[passage omitted] The task of senior statesmen is to ensure that there are no more wars in the world and that young people no longer kill each other or die on the battlefield, but live a full and creative life. That was the lofty thrust of the welcoming speech of M. Mayne, dean of Westminster Abbey, and of M.S. Gorbachev's speech in reply.

Before leaving the Abbey, M.S. Gorbachev answered a question from an IZVESTIYA correspondent.

[IZVESTIYA] Mikhail Sergeyevich, here in Westminster Abbey literally everything is imbued with the history of European politics, science, and culture. Do you not think that the spirit prevailing beneath the abbey vault is, as it were, linked philosophically with the idea of a common European home?

[Gorbachev] Yes, in Westminster Abbey, particularly at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, one has a particularly strong feeling of responsibility for the destiny of the Continent of Europe. Our duty to those who fell in the world wars—particularly those who died in World War II, when Soviet and British soldiers fought shoulder-to-shoulder against a common enemy—dictates the need to struggle for peace and implementation of the idea of a common European home. And I'm taking one other feeling away from Westminster Abbey: how important—I would even say, indisputable [neprelozhno]—it is to combine politics with morality. [Gorbachev ends]

The combination of politics and morality... A surprisingly moving illustration of these words was provided by M.S. Gorbachev's unplanned meeting with the Londoners waiting for him outside the abbey. The Soviet leader, surrounded by a dense crowd of people, shook hands, answered questions, exchanged good wishes, and asked questions himself. [passage omitted]

Gorbachev Talks With Londoners

LD0704215289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 7 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In addition to his official talks with British leaders, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had unplanned brief, but very warm and cordial meetings on the streets of London with Londoners.

Some people had come to Parliament Square with Soviet flags and placards reading: "Welcome, President Gorbachev." [video shows crowds, one with placard saying: "Welcome Mikhail Gorbachev, Long Live Communism," and another placard, half out of sight, saying: "British Troops out of Ireland;" video then shows Gorbachev, bodyguard, interpreter, and Raisa Gorbacheva getting out of car, others gathering around them]

[Begin recording] [Gorbachev] Tell them all loudly, I thank them all for their welcome.

[Interpreter] I thank you for your welcome. [end recording]

This meeting dispelled the legend of the famous stiffness and restraint of the British. We saw how the ice of the cold war has melted in their hearts, too.

Officials at Gorbachev Lunch With Queen

PM1004095989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 89 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Luncheon at Windsor Castle"]

[Text] London, 7 Apr—Queen Elizabeth II gave a luncheon today in honor of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and R.M. Gorbacheva.

The following attended the luncheon on the Soviet side: E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and L.M. Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Britain.

The following were present on the British side: members of the royal family, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe, and other officials.

M.S. Gorbachev held a conversation with Queen Elizabeth during which the Soviet leader extended to the queen an invitation to pay an official visit to the Soviet Union at a mutually acceptable time.

The queen expressed her thanks for the invitation and the hope that she would be able to avail herself of it at a suitable time.

The luncheon took place in the royal family's residence at Windsor Castle.

Thatcher Guildhall Speech Reported

PM1004084189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Apr 89 First Edition pp 1,2

[TASS report: "Potential for Trust Growing: The Conclusion of M.S. Gorbachev's Visit to Britain"]

[Excerpts] London, 7 Apr—Cordiality, sincerity, and warmth make up the atmosphere in which the brief but exceptionally packed official visit to Britain by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is coming to an end today. This atmosphere has indeed permeated all the meetings held on the banks of the Thames. No one hides the fact there are unresolved problems in Soviet-British relations and that there are also forces that oppose the process of normalization. However, the prevailing opinion here is that USSR-British dialogue is gaining in meaningfulness and significance not only on the bilateral plane, but also on the pan-European and broad international plane.

Hopes for positive changes in this dialogue could clearly be felt in the mood of the leaders of Britain today and the representatives of public and business circles gathered in

the ancient town hall of the City of London to meet with the Soviet leader. For 5 centuries the Guildhall has been a witness of and participant in all the significant events of the country's history. Today, too, history was made here. One of the West's most prestigious rostrums was offered to a political leader whose deep revolutionary transformations both inside and outside the country have won worldwide recognition.

Guests were greeted at the entrance to the Guildhall by the Lord Mayor, C. Collett, and his wife. He invited them into the hall for honored guests and presented the aldermen to them. A group of heads of diplomatic missions and ambassadors of socialist countries were present in the hall.

The places on the Guildhall podium were then occupied by M.S. Gorbachev, R.M. Gorbacheva, M. Thatcher, and D. Thatcher. The anthems of the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom were played.

Opening the meeting's ceremony, Lord Mayor C. Collett recalled that London's Guildhall had witnessed enemy action during the war in which our countries fought side-by-side to halt aggression. And now we are again side-by-side, he continued, trying to channel the course of events to reduce tension and establish peaceful and mutually beneficial cooperation among countries with different systems in all spheres. Your initiatives and the initiatives of our prime minister have seized the hearts and minds of all free-thinking and freedom-loving people throughout the world, a world which your courageous cosmonauts have helped unite with the infinite cosmos. And now, the lord mayor said, ceding the rostrum to M.S. Gorbachev, the world awaits your words. [passage omitted on Gorbachev's Guildhall speech]

Then Prime Minister M. Thatcher delivered a statement. She said:

Mr Gorbachev,

You enjoy wide respect in Great Britain as the leader of a great country. We see in you one of those rare people who possesses the vision and the personal qualities necessary to change the future of your own country and exert a profound influence upon the world as a whole. Today you have spoken about the enormous changes the Soviet Union is undergoing, we follow them attentively and sincerely hope that you succeed in solving your task—because we believe in your vision of a better life for the Soviet people, but also because every step toward greater democracy, human rights, and freedom of choice in your country brings us closer together. We are ready to render you every practical assistance. Here, in the center of London, is concentrated unequalled experience in trade and economics, and you will discover here heightened interest in your economic reforms and enormous readiness to take part in that process.

You recalled the difficulties that restructuring is experiencing. Of course there are difficulties; difficulties always accompany great endeavors. We believe that they will be overcome, and the recent elections have sustained us in this belief.

We also want to see fewer weapons, provided the security and defense of our country are constantly ensured. We also prefer to solve the world's problems by negotiations rather than by force. We also want to act together to solve broad global problems. You spoke, Mr President, about the common European home. We both want to feel safe in this home. West Europe's fears have diminished, but a long road must be traversed before they are definitively removed. Enormous and substantial changes have occurred recently, and we are beginning to make progress toward achieving that goal.

We will be able to build and mold our future if we show the will, imagination, and determination required. In your remarkable speech you showed that you have already engaged in this task. We await with impatience the day when your intentions, which you expounded here, will be put into practive.

We will study your speech with enormous care. We wish you and the entire Soviet people every success, prosperity, and the realization of all your plans.

At the end of the meeting in the Guildhall, the Soviet guests traveled to Windsor—the Queen's residence outside London. Sited 37 km from London, the castle sits atop a hill, amid picturesque parks and green meadows.

M.S. Gorbachev and R.M. Gorbacheva were met by Queen Elizabeth II and her husband, Prince Philip, the Duke of Edinburgh. After an exchange of greetings, the Duke of Edinburgh invited M.S. Gorbachev to inspect an honor guard. The Soviet leader received greetings in Russian from the commander of the guard.

The Soviet anthem was played.

After the luncheon the Queen gave in the eminent Soviet guest's honor, M.S. Gorbachev bade farewell to his Windsor Castle hosts and headed for Heathrow Airport.

The formal leave-taking ceremony for the Soviet leader began at Heathrow Airport at 1500 GMT. The following took part: the Queen's special representative, the lord chamberlain; British Prime Minister M. Thatcher and her husband, Dennis Thatcher; Foreign Secretary Geoffrey Howe; and other officials.

An honor guard consisting of Royal Air Force officers formed up and the Soviet anthem was played

M.S. Gorbachev delivered a press statement prior to departure. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev left for Moscow together with E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and V.M. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Correction to Gorbachev Guildhall Speech

WA1004161589

The following correction pertains to the item subheaded "Gorbachev Speech," published in the West Europe section of the 7 April Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, pages 26-30:

page 27, column one, second paragraph, first sentence make read: ...scale of many internal political, economic, social... (deleting comma)

page 28, column one, third paragraph, first sentence make read: ...to a dialogue, to interaction for the... (adding comma, changing "of interaction" to "to interaction")

page 28, column two, last paragraph, first sentence make read: ...men, including 1,596,000 land forces and 437,300 naval forces, with the remainder... (correcting terminology)

page 29, column two, last paragraph, sentence six make read ...the efforts and consistency of the prime... (correcting word)

Thatcher Speech at Heathrow Send-off

LD0704164189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Speech by British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher prior to Soviet leader Gorbachev's departure from Heathrow Airport, London at a ceremonial farewell attended by the queen's special representative the lord chamberlain, Dennis Thatcher, Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe, and other officials; Thatcher speaks in English with passage-by-passage translation into Russian—recorded]

[Text] Mr and Mrs Gorbachev, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It's been a real pleasure and a great privilege for us to have Mr and Mrs Gorbachev in this country as our honored guests. We heard a wonderful and remarkable speech from him in the Guildhall this morning, one that we shall always remember. And wherever they have been, the warmth and friendliness of Mr and Mrs Gorbachev has made a great impression on our people.

The talks and meetings we had have been conducted in an exceptionally friendly and warm atmosphere, in an atmosphere of great mutual understanding. They have come at a time when there is a new international understanding and cooperation, and we feel that this visit will take that forward further.

In saying goodbye to our honored guests, we'd like to send a message of great friendship to the people of the Soviet Union. We hope we shall see more of one another in the future. And to Mr and Mrs Gorbachev, we say thank you for a wonderful visit and haste ye back.

Gorbachev Speech at Heathrow Send-off

LD0704163689 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Speech by Soviet leader Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev prior to departure from Heathrow Airport, London at ceremonial farewell attended by the queen's special representative the lord chamberlain, British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and husband Dennis Thatcher, Foreign Secretary Sir Geoffrey Howe, and other officials—recorded]

[Text] Ladies and Gentlemen:

We are leaving London and Great Britain. We are leaving with a feeling of satisfaction; I would even say, with a feeling of great satisfaction. During these brief hours we have managed, it seems to me, to do some useful work together. During those hours, Mrs Thatcher and I were able to deepen our dialogue, and I would say that the dialogue covered all the issues of bilateral relations and European and world politics. I would say that I draw the conclusion that this visit and these talks raise our relations to a higher level. I am sure that there will be a continuation and we shall be able to make a joint contribution toward improving the world situation and solving the problems relating to the field of disarmament and the political settlement of conflicts. And we have been able, it seems, to provide fresh impetus to the expansion of Soviet-British cooperation in the economic and cultural fields. New conditions have been created for the development of exchanges.

I think it will be no exaggeration if I say that today's Soviet-British dialogue is a considerable positive factor. We will continue our contacts, our dialogue. In conclusion, I want to inform you that, on behalf of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, I have invited the Queen of Britain to visit our country at a time convenient for her. We will look forward to her visit. In accordance with an agreement between us, there is to be a meeting with Mrs Thatcher in order to continue the discussion and solution of problems. Our people will provide hospitality and attention to the prime minister of Britain. I and all who came with me this time to Britain have been much impressed by the atmosphere in which the visit has passed. We attribute that to the government of Mrs Thatcher, whom I thank for the hospitality. But we also experienced warmness from many British people. And I would like to use this opportunity to express to them, on behalf of myself and our Soviet people, a feeling of

fondness. The citizens of Britain can count on us being ready for the further expansion of cooperation and for bringing our peoples closer together. Thank you.

Gorbachev Returns to Moscow

LD0704193689 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1848 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 7 Apr (TASS)—M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, returned to Moscow from Great Britain, where he had been on an official visit at the invitation of the leadership of that country. He had paid an official, friendly visit to Cuba at the invitation of Fidel Castro Ruz, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Cuba and chairman of the Council of State and Council of Ministers of the Republic of Cuba. On the way to Cuba, M.S. Gorbachev stopped over at the Irish airport at Shannon, where the first Soviet-Irish summit took place.

M.S. Gorbachev was accompanied on his journey by E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR minister of foreign affairs; A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and V.M. Kamentsev, a deputy chairman of the USSR Council of MInisters.

M.S. Gorbachev was met at the airport by L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K Ligachev, V.A. Medvedev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, and V.M. Chebrikov, members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo; candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo A.P. Biryukova, A.V. Vlasov, A.I. Lukyanov, G.P. Razumovskiy, and D.T. Yazov; secretary of the CPSU Central Committee O.D. Baklanov; and other comrades.

In the welcoming party were Cuba's ambassador to the USSR, J. Camacho, the British charge d'affaires in the USSR, N. Marshall, and the Irish charge d'affaires in the USSR, D. Macfhionnbhairr.

Thatcher-Gorbachev Talks View Arms, U.S.-UK Ties

PM1004111389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interview With Margaret Thatcher"]

[Text] London, 8 Apr—At the end of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to Britain, Prime Minister M. Thatcher gave an interview to British television in which she dwelt on the results of her talks with the Soviet leader.

I think that what Gorbachev is doing is very bold and courageous, she said. He has his own vision of the future. He is advancing towards that goal and not allowing himself to stop and deviate. I understand that kind of courage. So the situation will gradually change. We have already held out our hands to one another across everything that divides us.

[Moscow TASS in English at 1146 GMT on 8 April carries a similar report on Thatcher's interview with British television on her talks with Gorbachev which adds the following: "She described the talks with Gorbachev as open and friendly and said they were marked by a common interest for detail and a desire to overcome differences."]

In the course of our meetings and talks with the Soviet leader, Britain's prime minister went on, we both debated and disputed without any hostility, with great interest in the arguments, and in an endeavor to secure some solution. It was very unusual for a Soviet statesman to behave like that from the outset when he came here 4 years ago. We clearly showed him that our country can never be separated from the United States, and so it is pointless to try to do that. I did not attempt to sever his relations with the Warsaw Pact countries. We began on that very frank basis.

Then suddenly, like thunder in a clear sky (M. Gorbachev probably did some hard thinking about this), these refreshing historic speeches were heard and he seemed to have the determination worthy of his vision of the future. I think future generations will say that he was a man of destiny. That is very important. We must encourage him.

I think that some of what he has done is already irreversible, including greater political freedom and greater communications on human rights... But there is still a long way to go. I also indicated this in my speech. What he has begun is a new and fresh cause that must not be suppressed.

In response to the question of what was new and important in M.S. Gorbachev's Guildhall speech, M. Thatcher said the following: Not only the substance of the speech, but also the very time it was made—after the elections in the Soviet Union, which were a very important event for me, especially the fact that 90 percent of the electorate came to the polls and the way in which they voted.

Touching on the prospects for developing relations between East European countries and the EEC, M. Thatcher indicated: Of course, Europe is more than a common market, and we must all remember that... It is important for the situation to change in the right way.

Question: M. Gorbachev said at the Guildhall that fears regarding a Soviet military threat are unfounded. Do you believe him?

Answer: As they have quite a large quantity of arms and armed forces, they (the Soviet Union—TASS note) have twice as many as us, even after the unilateral reductions. That is an extremely large superiority, and you cannot and must not disregard it.

M. Thatcher then acknowledged that "there will be definite disputes over figures, and the place for these disputes will be the Vienna talks." The Soviet Union, she claimed, has completed its nuclear modernization program; we have not. I admit that Gorbachev's intentions are good. But you cannot build a system of defense on good intentions. The world is unpredictable. Terrible events occur. You must always be ready with a strong defense. Hostility may arise anywhere.

M. Thatcher expressed doubts that the modernization of NATO's short-range missiles could jeopardize and sabotage the Vienna talks on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe.

The prime minister was asked the following question: Are there any circumstances in which you would not persist in modernizing or, at any rate, in deploying the modernized arms?

If you want to prevent war, M. Thatcher replied, you will not do that using outmoded arms. Tanks, aircraft, antitank and antiaircraft arms, come what may, are nuclear arms and must be modernized...

Britain's prime minister also pointed out that, in her opinion, expenditure on nuclear arms is not a "stumbling block" that could block the development of East-West relations.

Gerasimov Meets Press on Gorbachev UK Visit

LD0804142389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1030 GMT 8 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast; S. Alekseyev video report from London on 7 April press conference held by Academician Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations; Grachev, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; Chumakov, deputy foreign economic relations minister; Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Great Britain; and Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate]

[Text] [Announcer] in London on 7 April a concluding news conference was held by Soviet experts on the results of the visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to Great Britain.

[Begin recording] [Alekseyev] Taking part in the press conference were Academician Primakov, director of the Institute of World Economy and International Relations; Grachev, deputy head of the CPSU Central Committee International Department; Chumakov, deputy minister of foreign economic relations; and Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Great Britain. The press conference was headed by Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate.

[Gerasimov] The visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to great Britain has come to an end. It came off very well. You know this. Nevertheless, we have still decided to meet you once again at the end of it all and answer the questions we have not yet answered in the last few days you have been meeting Soviet representatives.

[Alekseyev] Answering a question on the general results of the latest Soviet-British meeting at summit level, Andrey Grachev said:

[Grachev] It seems to me that in political life there are various ways to measure the efficiency and productivity of any political events. We believe that the meeting held was extremely important. This was also mentioned by Comrade General Secretary Gorbachev before he departed. We consider it to have been productive and useful. We proceed from the fact that every meeting at the leadership level between representatives of the USSR and Great Britain promotes and develops the political dialogue not only between our two countries, but also between East and West.

[Alekseyev] in reply to a question on the essential differences that still remain between the two countries, Academician Primakov said:

[Primakov] Obviously, you understand that differences remain between the two great powers, both on the ideological and political planes. But this is not what is important at present. What is imporant, as I see it, lies in that a process has started, a process that is proceeding quite intensively. As a result of this process, an active exchange of views is taking place on all questions of mutual interest, without any exceptions. The degree of trust during this exchange of views is growing. But this does not at all mean that all disagreements are being lifted immediately, so to speak.

[Alekseyev] On the results of talks on the development of trade and economic cooperation, Yuriy Chumakov said:

[Chumakov] One agreement has been signed and another coordinated in principle at intergovernmental level. What is involved here is an agreement on the encouragement and mutual protection of capital investments, which was signed during the visit. The significance of this agreement consists in that it creates, I would say, a foundation for broader capital investments by British firms in the USSR, thereby establishing more confidence and guarantees that these capital investments will not disappear or vanish but will serve the purposes for which capital is being invested.

The second thing is that a protocol has been endorsed on the intentions to render assistance in creating consortiums. This is a protocol in which the governments of both countries pledge to encourage and create appropriate conditions for the development of new forms of economic cooperation between the two countries. What is involved here is a broadening of coproduction in the

sphere of production, and the creating of joint enterprises. To me the most important thing involved here is creating a more complex form of such joint enterprises unified into a consortium.

[Alekseyev] The question has been put to the experts as to whether it is true that the USSR has completed the modernization of its tactical nuclear weapons.

[Gerasimov] The USSR is not undertaking any modernization of its nuclear weapons, nor does it intend to do so unless it is forced to. This is the Soviet position. We have talked about this several times, without making any specific references as to whether tactical nuclear weapons and medium-range weapons in Europe are involved. We said that all types of nuclear weapons are involved in stating that at a certain stage it is necessary to break the vicious cycle of competition between East and West concerning the improvement, modernization, and creation of new kinds, types, and varieties of nuclear weapons, and to put a stop to our chasing each other around this circle. In making its quite resolute and sometimes one-sided gestures, the USSR has already set an example in this respect several times to Western superpowers. We hope that at a certain stage we can count on the West to follow suit.

[Alekseyev] The participants of the press conference answered other questions concerning the development of relations between the USSR and Great Britain. [video showing press conference proceedings] [end recording]

'Pessimists' on Soviet-UK Ties Rebutted

PM1004112789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Special correspondents A. Krivopalov and M. Sturua dispatch under the "Panorama of International Events" rubric: "Horizons of Trust Broadening"]

[Text] London—The Il-62M aircraft that had taken off from London's Heathrow Airport was still en route to Moscow when Britain's Prime Minister M. Thatcher gave her first assessment of the results of M.S. Gorbachev's official visit in one of the rooms of the Queen Elizabeth conference center: "It was a very successful, warm, and friendly visit."

"In my opinion," she said, "Mr Gorbachev is a dynamic and determined statesman, who is confidently implementing his reform program." The prime minister stressed the great significance of restructuring in the USSR for international relations.

So, restructuring and international policy... Speaking at London's famous Guildhall, M.S. Gorbachev spoke of these two things and the organic link between these two components at the present time in light of the new political thinking.

We talked with a number of politicians and public figures and also with representatives from the world of business, science, and the arts who were invited to the Guildhall.

"Mikhail Gorbachev spoke in a very friendly fashion. He spoke highly of the contribution of the British Government and M. Thatcher to strengthening political stability in the world," N. Wooding, a prominent businessman and chairman of the Anglo-Soviet Chamber of Commerce, told us. "It is very important for us that our eminent visitor underlined restructuring as a long-term process that will continue permanently. Gorbachev expounded his views on the disarmament problem in Europe and throughout the world. I was fortunate enough to meet the Soviet leader twice during this visit. As in 1984, he once again gave a mighty additional boost and spur to our common efforts aimed at improving the state of economic ties between our two countries, which need it."

"What do I think of the general secretary's speech? You saw his reception here." The broad smile on the face of R. Maxwell, chairman of the powerful MIRROR publishing group, indicated better than words his impression of the speech he had just heard at the Guildhall. "On the whole, this visit is an event of tremendous significance. A triumph. Gorbachev is a politician who has been able to make himself understood to people here. I think some people in the United States are now even more afraid that Europe will really be able to embark on the disarmament path under the influence of the Soviet leader's personality. The people of the USSR have increasing grounds to be proud of such a leader. I must also say that Mrs Thatcher's speech today is also worthy of note because it virtually completely supported what Gorbachev said."

"A remarkable address. Strong and powerful," we heard from D. Healey, a major Labour Party figure, former minister, and member of the House of Commons. "This year the Soviet leader has other visits to Western Europe planned—to the FRG and France. He obviously intends to make some concrete proposals within the framework of the idea of creating an all-European home. We are struck by the new details on disarmament in his speech. I am sure that the kind words M. Gorbachev addressed to the British people will make a great impression on them. It is also worth pointing out what M. Thatcher said at the Guildhall. Her words will meet with a good response both within Britain and also, I think, in the USSR. Yes, the horizons of trust are broadening. But that by no means signifies that they are absolutely serene. The talks in London showed once again that Soviet and British standpoints, for instance, on the question of modernizing tactical nuclear weapons are based on different philosophical concepts. We reckon that a nuclear-free world and a nuclear-free Europe are a token of security. People at No 10 Downing Street proceed on the premise that only nuclear deterrence can guarantee a peaceful future for mankind."

Noting this clash, local pessimists are trying to play down the significance of the Soviet-British summit. Deliberately or involuntarily, they are failing to take into consideration the dynamics and thrust in the development of relations between our two countries and refusing to see how understanding of the sides' positions, trust, and the inclination for cooperation and the quest for mutually acceptable solutions are growing from meeting to meeting. This process of transition from quantitative to qualitative changes is of tremendous significance not only for the USSR and Britain, but also for all Europe and for the entire world. This week's events in London are undoubtedly a crucial, weighty contribution to historic East-West dialogue, since it is the survival of human civilization that is involved here.

...It is hard, sometimes impossible, for newspaper reporters to contend with television, particularly when the subject or, to be more accurate, the portrayal is a ceremony like the Soviet leader's visit to Windsor Castle, where he was received by Queen Elizabeth II. The fact that M.S. Gorbachev is the first Soviet head of state to visit Windsor Castle, the fact that he invited Queen Elizabeth II to the Soviet Union and the fact that this was accepted and a British monarch's visit to our country, for the first time in the entire history of Soviet-British relations, is in prospect—all this is not just so much protocol, albeit protocol of the highest level. It is something rather more important. The Windsor phase of M.S. Gorbachev's visit symbolically reflected how far the horizons of trust and mutual understanding have broadened in Soviet-British relations, and how our power's international prestige has grown.

We will not hide the fact that the question of Queen Elizabeth II's possible visit to the Soviet Union was debated extensively in the British Isles both in political circles and among those whom it is usual to call the "man in the street." The verdict of the overwhelming majority was "Go!"

Lunch at Windsor Castle was over and the queen saw off M.S. Gorbachev. And the sendoff went like this: "See you again."

Deputy Premier Silayev Visits W. Germany

Meets Kohl in Bonn

LD0704205389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1830 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and cochairman of the USSR-FRG Commission for Economic, Scientific and Technical Cooperation, who is in Bonn, has been received by Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl. There was a discussion of matters of developing bilateral relations in light of the forthcoming visit to the FRG by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. Perceptible moves in many directions of cooperation between the two countries, in the spheres of (?politics), security, disarmament, the economy, ecology, science, technology, culture, and humanitarian links were mentioned. The conviction was expressed that Comrade Gorbachev's visit to the FRG will make possible the consolidation and development of the positive trend in relations between the two countries and impart to them a new dynamism and scale.

Visits Engels Museum, Meets Rau

LD0904144589 Moscow TASS in English 1406 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Bonn April 9 TASS—A Soviet delegation led by Ivan Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, that has come to West Germany to attend the 27th session of the Soviet-West German commission on economic, scientific and technical cooperation, visited the city of Wuppertal on Sunday.

The delegation saw there a memorial museum of Friedrich Engels, one of the founders of scientific communism, friend and asociate of Karl Marx. The head of the delegation made an entry in the distinguished visitors book of the Engels museum.

On the same day Ivan Silayev had a conversation in Wupperatal with Joahnnes Rau, minister-president of North Rhine-Westphalia. They discussed questions connected with the development of economic, scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and West Germany, specifically, a possibility of a further upgrading of direct contacts between West German lands and union republics.

French Defense Minister Continues USSR Visit

Addresses Moscow News Conference

OW0804093089 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2135 GMT 6 Apr 89

[From the "Novosti" newscast; Sturua video report on news conference held by French Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow on 5 April—recorded]

[Text] Jean-Pierre Chevenement, France's defense minister, gave a news conference at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center. He is on an official visit to the USSR. [video shows Army General V.M. Shabanov, French officers, and people in the audience at press conference]

It has been 10 years since a French defense minister last visited our country. This was due to the unfavorable international climate that formed at the end of the seventies. It is no surprise that Jean-Pierre Chevenement's current visit to the Soviet Union has met with great interest among journalists.

Chevenement pointed to our country's new policy as the factor permitting renewal of the interrupted contacts between the Soviet Union and France in the military sphere. [video shows Chevenement, seated at desk, addressing the press center audience]

The reorientation of Soviet military strategy towards a defensive posture—reducing the military budget, armed forces, and arms—that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has announced was one of the main topics in the French defense minister's talks with his Soviet colleague, Army General Yazov, and his meeting with Comrade Ryzhkov. Jean-Pierre Chevenement noted that he was primarily interested in practical measures being taken to realize these peace initiatives. [video cuts from pan shots of audience to show Chevenement speaking]

[Chevenement, in French fading into Sturua's superimposed Russian] During my meeting with Mr Ryzhkov, he told me that the main reductions in the armed forces will be implemented over a 2-year period. In particular, they are already affecting the 1990 budget. As for converting the military industry, this will take longer. However, by 1995 these plants will be operating at only 40 percent of capacity. We are satisfied with this state of affairs. [end Chevenement]

Jean-Pierre Chevenement also described his visit to the Taman Division and the military airbase in Kubinka. He reported that one result of the talks between the two countries' ministers was an agreement that President of the French Republic Mitterrand and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will sign during the latter's visit to France in July this year.

Visits Murmansk, Severomorsk

PM0704134189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "Tour of the Country"]

[Text] French Defense Minister J.P. Chevenement, who is paying an official visit to the Soviet Union, and the officials accompanying him left for a tour of the country 6 April.

The visitor was seen off at Sheremetyevo Airport by the following: Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, USSR deputy defense minister; and other officials.

The French and Soviet state flags were hoisted at the airport and an honor guard was formed on the airfield.

Army General V.M. Shabanov, USSR deputy defense minister, is accompanying the guest on his tour of the country.

On the same day French Defense Minister J.P. Chevenement and his wife visited the cities of Murmansk and Severomorsk. He was met at Murmansk Airport by Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin, commander-in-chief of the USSR Navy and USSR deputy defense minister; Fleet Admiral F.N. Gromov, commander of the Northern Fleet; and Yu.Z. Balakshin, chairman of the Murmansk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee.

J.P. Chevenement visited the "Marshal Ustinov" guided-missile cruiser, was familiarized with its equipment, and talked to personnel. On board the cruiser the French defense minister and Fleet Admiral V.N. Chernavin answered questions from Soviet and French journalists.

The French defense minister laid flowers on the monument to the defenders of the Soviet polar regions and saw the sights of Murmansk.

J.P. Chevenement and his wife left for Volgograd 6 April.

Leaves Volgograd for France

LD0704171189 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Volgograd April 7 TASS—French Defence Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement left for home today.

He was on an official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Soviet defence minister, Gen. Dmitriy Yazov.

Visit Sign of 'Opening' in Ties

LD0904213289 Moscow International Service in French 2000 GMT 18 Apr 89

[Vsevolod Mikhaylov commentary]

[Text] French Defense Minister Jean-Pierre Chevenement ended his official visit to the USSR. This was the first visit by a French defense minister to the USSR since 1977, writes our observer Vsevolod Mikhaylov. A sign of constructive dialogue and of overtures for opening up, it has been all the more significant as Jean-Pierre Chevenement does not rank among the doves of French politics. A strong supporter of the continued policy of nuclear deterrence, he considers nuclear arms a guarantor of peace. He reiterated this in Moscow, when addressing the students of the Soviet General Staff Academy. He expressed more than once his skepticism toward restructuring in the military field in the USSR, but this time he had more than one opportunity of seeing everything on the spot.

The French Defense minister's visit coincided with a period that is very important for the Soviet Armed Forces; the forces are the object of practical measures aimed at military restructuring. Thus, the Soviet military doctrine has been reviewed from top to bottom to become a defensive one, and practical work is being

carried out to restructure the Soviet Armed Forces. The USSR is actively preparing the recently announced unilateral reduction in arms and staff and is perfecting the plans to reconvert several arms factories. In parallel, it is reducing [comprimer] its military budget and cutting down the production of equipment destined to the Army.

Magnificent possibilities have been offered to the French defense minister to see what is happening within the Soviet Armed Forces. This spirit of opening up has been reflected in particular in the fact that Jean-Pierre Chevenement is the first foreigner to visit Severomorsk, one of the most secret USSR navy bases. No foreigner has visited it since World War II.

Soviet initiatives and the opening-up spirit have not left the French defense minister cold. He said he tried to understand better what is going on in the USSR, particularly in the military field. During his meeting with the head of the Soviet Government Nikolay Ryzhkov, Jean-Pierre Chevenement expressed satisfaction with the practical measures taken by the Soviet Union to reduce its Armed Forces. Also, he said he favors the Soviet peace initiatives and highly appreciates Mikhail Gorbachev's UN address.

During the talks in Moscow the two sides stressed the importance of talks on conventional arms and the measures to consolidate confidence and security in Europe, which have opened in Vienna. At the same time, the Soviet side drew attention of its interlocutor to phenomena that negatively impact on the development of the military-political situation and on the general atmosphere in Europe. First of all, there is a question on the plan to increase the nuclear systems perfected or already being implemented in some West European countries. It is no secret to anyone that among these is also France, which is modernizing its short-range systems and testing a new weapon in this category: the Hades missile, which has a range of 480 km.

At the same time, France is working toward installation of the so-called European defense, which would be covered by the French nuclear umbrella.

In short, there are quite a few differences in the manner in which Moscow and Paris approach the issue of European security, but what matters is that the two sides are willing to pursue their search for points of convergence and continue their constructive dialogue to overcome divisions. The visit yielded an agreement of principle on the resumption of [word indistinct] military contacts and on a program of military exchanges. Such contacts between the military of the two countries are called upon to promote confidence and eradicate mutual distrust.

Latin America & Caribbean

U.S Citizen Arrested in Panama for 'Espionage'

LD0904161189 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Panama City April 9 TASS—An investigation is being continued here in connection with the arrest of Kurt Frederick Muse, a U.S. citizen, who is being charged with espionage and subversive acivity against Panama.

After Muse was detained at Omar Torrijos Airport on Thursday, Panamanian security personnel discovered at his place a large amount of arms, a powerful radio transmitter, the Republic's maps with the military facilities of the country's National Defence Forces marked on them, and subversive literature.

The lists of addresses found there enabled security bodies to uncover on the same day a whole network of eight clandestine television and radio stations which had operated for 18 months on Panamanian territory under the general name of "The Voice of Freedom."

At a press conference local and foreign journalists were shown the equipment which makes it possible to interrupt television and radio channels and to broadcast on the same frequencies calls for disobedience to authorities and an overthrow of the present government.

At the same press conference Muse confirmed that he was the leader of the "Voice of Freedom." Besides, he admitted that his actions had been coordinated by the U.S. Department of State and were aimed at assisting the country's right-wing opposition in winning the forthcoming general election on May 7, this year.

As was already reported, on the premises where television and radio broadcast equipment was discovered, security personnel also found cassettes and transcripts of broadcasts which were to be aired on the day following the polling. They contained accusations that the national government and military leadership of the republic falsified the polling results. There were also cassettes with recording prepared in advance in the event of the opposition's win.

Equipment for listening in to telephone conversations was found at Muse's place. Among the telephone numbers fed into the computer's programme was also a telephone number of Carlos Duque, presidential candidate for the National Liberation Coalition.

In answer to journalists' question whether Muse's sensational revelations were the result of application of impermissible interrogation methods to the arrested, Muse himself replied in the negative.

The latest report by investigating bodies sheds light on how the bulky and sophisticated equipment for clandestine broadcasts got into Panamanian territory. Some boxes in which the up-to-date equipment was brought to the country bear the address of the recipient "140th Brigade, Fort Clayton, Southern Command of the U.S. Army in Panama.

The U.S. Embassy in Panama has circulated a note among journalists, reporting that its representatives, 'by agreement with the Southern Command,' launched their own inquiry into Muse's case.

Political & Social

Georgian Mass Rallies Provoke Violence, Confrontation

Patiashvili Warns Against 'Discord'

LD0804144689 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—Anti-constitutional actions in Abkhazia, an autonomous republic in Soviet Georgia, sparked off several days of rallies and marches in Tbilisi, Georgia's capital, the newspaper IZVESTIYA reported Saturday.

It said students and staff members of some institutions and scientific and cultural organisations are taking part in them. The social and political life in Tbilisi is complicated.

The newspaper said that "demands at the rallies that those who kindle ethnic strife be strictly punished and calls for strengthening the republic's territorial integrity and for consolidating forces on the basis of perestroyka processes are accompanied by anti-Soviet and anti-socialist slogans."

On April 6, a plenum of Abkhazia's regional committee of the Georgian Communist Party in Sukhumi relieved Boris Adlejba of the duties of the committee's first secretary.

Local newspapers published an appeal of distinguished people of the autonomous republic to the people of Abkhazia, denouncing the lack of restraint on the part of some individuals and calling on them to find a way out of the confrontation deadlock.

Georgian leaders met cultural personalities, scientists and senior executives of ministries, departments, higher educational and scientific establishments and the mass media at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee in Tbilisi Friday.

"Representatives of the intelligentsia expressed serious concern over the dangerous scope that the rallies and demonstrations have acquired," IZVESTIYA said. "The meetings pointed to the passive coverage of the events by the local mass media."

Dzhumber Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, spoke on Georgian television Friday night.

He called on Georgia's population "not to open the door to discord and enmity and to stop at the dangerous line". He also voiced the hope that the people "will not wish to turn off the road of democratisation which has just been opened to them".

4th Day of Unrest in Tbilisi

LD0804172489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1645 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 8 Apr (TASS)—Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia, is in turmoil for the fourth day. Continuous meetings, in which thousands of people, the majority of them young, are participating, are taking place outside the government building on the central Rustaveli Prospect. The leaders of unofficial associations of extremist persuasion have chosen as a pretext for the staging of these unauthorized group actions the events in the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic, where on 18 March in the village of Lykhny, Gudautskiy Rayon, there was a gathering of many thousands, raising the issue of altering the status of the autonomous republic.

However, the leaders of certain unofficial associations have completely different aims, far removed from the interests of strengthening the friendship and fraternity of all peoples living in Georgia. They managed to substitute for the initial slogans appeals of an anti-Soviet and anti-socialist content. They are heating up the atmosphere, working up and exciting people, and putting forward unacceptable demands. Attempts are being made to involve work collectives and town residents in the illegal acts. However, at the gates of the majority of works and factories in the republican capital the instigators got the rebuff they deserved from the workers.

The party and local soviet bodies in the republic are exerting every effort to defuse the tense situation. Otari Cherkeziya, chairman of the Presidium of the Georgian SSR Supreme Soviet, has appealed to the working people. On 7 April, Dzhumber Patiashvili, first secretary of the Communist Party of Georgia Central Committee, spoke on radio and television. His address was met with a response by the broad strata of the population in the republic. Many labor collectives and prominent representatives of the scientific and creative intelligentsia have declared their support for the position of the Communist Party Central Committee and the government of the republic.

A meeting of the Georgian party aktiv was held today, at which Dzhumber Patiashvili spoke. Those attending the meeting discussed the tasks of the republican party organization regarding normalization of the political situation, and declared that Georgia has been, is, and will be a socialist sovereign republic in the fraternal family of the peoples of the USSR.

A comprehensive plan of urgent organizational and political measures has been implemented by party organizations, and by the trade union and Komsomol aktivs. Explanatory work has been stepped up in the collectives of enterprises and institutions, and educational establishments; and the most prestigious representatives of the intelligentsia have been actively drawn into dialogue with young people. Their insistent appeals to reason, well-considered behavior and a high degree of civic

responsibility resound from the pages of newspapers and from television screens. Measures are being implemented to ensure discipline and public order.

An address from the Communist Party of the Georgia Central Committee, the presidium of the Supreme Soviet and the Council of Ministers of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic to communists, the working people of the republic, and young people has been broadcast on television.

Tanks Meet 'Thousands' of Protesters

AU0804202189 Paris AFP in English 2015 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, April 8 (AFP)—Thousands of nationalists demonstrated Saturday in the Georgian capital, Tbilisi, where Soviet tanks and armoured vehicles rumbled through the streets, local sources said.

The demonstrators joined hunger strikers demanding independence for the southern Soviet republic, the sources said.

Georgian militants said a recent wave of strikes had subsided in Tbilisi on Saturday, although pickets were stil posted around high schools and colleges, which were still on strike.

Tens of thousands of demonstrators gathered outside the local government building on Friday demanding independence and the suppression of the Abkhazian republic's autonomous status within Georgia.

Many dispersed after five or six armoured cars drove past, although some demonstrators lay down in the road to try to stop them, while others managed to climb on to the cars, nationalist sources said.

On Thursday, Georgian authorities dismissed the first secretary of the Abkhazian republic, Boris Adleyba, replacing him with the vice-president of the Georgian environment committee, M.V. Khichba. The move followed sharp official criticism of anti-constitutional activities in the region.

The Abkhazian republic was rocked by clashes on April 1 in which several people were injured.

The first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party, Dzhumber Patiashvili, promised to consider demonstrators' demands in a television broadcast on Friday. [passage omitted]

16 Reported Killed

OW0904133389 Tokyo KYODO in English 1301 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, April 9 KYODO—Sixteen people were killed and more than 100 people were injured Sunday when demonstrators in Soviet Georgia clashed with government troops, a local news agency told KYODO NEWS AGENCY.

The republic's television, following a news blackout Sunday morning, reported details of the early-morning clash Sunday afternoon, according to a foreign wire service report from Sukhumi.

The violence erupted after a two-day demonstration by an estimated 100,000 people in the Georgian capital of Tbilisi. Demonstrators called for Georgia to secede from the Soviet Union while troops with armoured vehicles were called in to restore order, the wire service reported.

Demonstrators gathered outside the main government building in the city center and refused repeated appeals to disband, the report said. It said 91 soldiers were hurt and 20 of them were hospitalized.

The television report said the troops had not used their weapons, but did not clarify how the deaths ocurred. Some demonstrators carried knives, according to the wire service report.

Death Toll 'Could Be Higher'

AU0904154389 Paris AFP in English 1529 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Excerpts] Moscow, April 9 (AFP)—Baton-wielding Soviet special forces clashed with demonstrating nationalists in the Georgian capital, Tbilisi, early Sunday, and left 16 people dead and about 100 injured, residents said.

The residents, reached by telephone, who quoted an official statement broadcast Sunday by Georgian television, said the real number of victims could be higher.

They also said that several arrests were made after the special Interior Ministry troops moved in at 4:00 am on Sunday morning.

The troops charged "thousands" of people gathered for the fourth day outside the government administrative building around about 100 hunger strikers calling for Georgian independence, the residents said.

Troops, who were sent to Georgia the previous day to quell the latest outbreak of nationalist unrest to hit the Soviet Union, used metal truncheons and tear gas to disperse the demonstrators, they said.

The hunger strikers, who had also called for an end to the autonomous status of the Abkhazian republic located along Georgia's Black Sea coast, belong to a group called "the national independence party", residents said.

The soldiers also clashed with Georgian police who tried to move in between the two sides, they added.

In the official televised communique, the authorities blamed extremists for the deaths, according to residents. Scheduled television and radio broadcasts on Sunday were made impossible by a strike by journalists.

A curfew was declared and several people were detained at the scene of the clashes, while nationalist militants Zviad Gamsakhurdia and Murab Kostava were arrested at their homes Sunday, the residents said.

Mr. Kamsakhurdia's sister-in-law told AGENCE FRANCE-PRESSE that "orders were given to cast silence over the massacre. The public telephones no longer work, many militants' lines have been cut".

Residents also reported that soldiers were blocking access to the city's main street, where groups of demonstrators were gathered outside government buildings.

They added that an unofficial "day of mourning" had been declared in Tbilisi.

Black flags were being flown and graffiti had appeared on walls accusing Dzhumber Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party, of being "an assassin and a traitor".

Mr. Patiashvili, had promised to consider demonstrators' demands in a television broadcast on Friday [7 April].

Tbilisi residents said Sunday that a demonstration on April 4 by a separate nationalist group had called for the leaders of Abkhazian to be punished for seeking Abkhazian's complete independence from Georgia.

The group had claimed that the Abkhazian leaders' calls provoked inter-ethnic clashes between Abkhazians and Georgians on April [date as received] which left several people injured, residents said.

Following the demonstration, a strike committee was set up to take action over the Abkhazian issue. The result was that public transport, the university and, on April 7, certain enterprises were hit by strikes, militants said.

Earlier Sunday, an unofficial Moscow newspaper reported that the hunger strikers were clubbed and dragged from the steps of the government building.

The independent new bulletin EXPRESS-KHRONIKA added that unofficial groups in Tbilisi had warned that "a movement of civil disobedience might be launched Monday in Georgia". [passage omitted]

Telephone communications with Tbilisi were difficult Sunday and no official organisations there answered calls.

IZVESTIYA Reports on Situation

PM0804170789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Own correspondent T. Chanturiya report: "Situation in Tbilisi"]

[Text] Tbilisi—As already reported in IZVESTIYA, rallies and processions have been going on for several days in Tbilisi in connection with the anticonstitutional actions that have occurred in the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]. Young students, schoolchildren, and also workers from some establishments and scientific and creative organizations are taking part in them. Sociopolitical life in the republic's capital has become more difficult.

Alongside demands that those responsible for stirring up national discord be severely punished and appeals to strengthen the republic's territorial integrity and consolidate forces on the basis of the restructuring processes, slogans of an anti-Soviet and antisocialist content are also heard at rallies.

As already reported, an Abkhaz Oblast Georgian Communist Party Committee [Obkom] plenum held in Sukhumi 6 April released B. Adleyba from his duties as obkom first secretary. Oblast newspapers published an appeal by distinguished people in the autonomous republic to the citizens of the Abkhaz region asking them to condemn the lack of restraint shown by certain people and to find a way out of the impasse of confrontation.

On 7 April a meeting of the republic leadership with representatives of the creative and scientific intelligentsia and leaders of ministries, departments, higher educational institutions, scientific establishments, and the mass media was held at the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee.

Representatives of the intelligentsia expressed their deep concern at the fact that the rallies and demonstrations had assumed dangerous proportions. The passivity of local mass media coverage of the events was noted.

On the evening of 7 April D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, broadcast an appeal to the population of Georgia on republic television. He urged people not to betray the traditional wisdom of the Georgian people and not to

open the door to discord and enmity or cross the danger line, and he expressed the hope that the people will not wish to swerve from the path of democratization that has only just been opened up.

Rallies, Countermeasures Described

PM1004094389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 89 Second Edition p 8

[TASS report: "On the Situation on Tbilisi]

[Text] Meetings which have been exploited by groups of extremists to fan unhealthy emotions in the city and the republic have been taking place over the last few days outside the government building in Tbilisi, the capital of Georgia.

On the night of 8 April after 2100, in spite of the measures being taken by party, local soviet, and law and order bodies, the situation at the meeting became dramatically more complex and got out of control. Those involved in the meeting called upon the population of the republic to hold strikes and to demonstrate civil insubordination. Slogans of a nationalistic, anti-Soviet nature were put forward, fanning interethnic discord and appealing for the elimination of Soviet power in Georgia, the creation of a provisional government in the republic, and Georgia's secession from the USSR. The leaders of the so-called "National-Liberation Movement of Georgia" publicized plans for seizing power. The crowd threatened the Communists and the authorities' representatives.

Those at the meeting did not respond to the numerous appeals from the leaders of the republic, eminent figures of science and culture, and representatives of the public to be reasonable and disperse. The organizers of the meetings continued to inflame passions. Nor did they heed an appeal from Ilya II, Catholicos of Georgia, who spoke to those assembled, dealing with him roughly and without ceremony.

In this situation, with the aim of ensuring public safety and averting unpredictable consequences, the leadership of the republic made the decision to break up the anti-Soviet and anti-social gathering and clear the government building square.

Units of the Ministry of Internal Affairs and troops strictly fulfilled the instructions against the use of weapons, and used precautionary measures, especially toward women and adolescents. But separate groups of extremists, armed with stones, sticks, and metal objects, put up fierce resistance. Their actions caused a crush, resulting in 16 dead. Several dozen received injuries varying in severity. Seventy-five servicemen and militia members also suffered. The injured were given urgent medical aid.

To investigate the causes of the tragic consequences of the events, a government commission has been formed. It is led by Zurab Chkheidze, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic. No one is currently assembled in the square in front of the government building; the area is under the control of military units. Some of the instigators of the disturbances have been detained. An investigation is being conducted. Measures are being taken to prevent new anti-social demonstrations. The republican organs decided to introduce a curfew in the city.

The working class, peasantry, intelligentsia, and working collectives of the republic denounce the provocative actions of the extremists, which have had grave consequences, and demand that the authorities ensure normalization of life, security, calm, and order.

Activists Report 30-50 Dead

LD1004080589 Hamburg DPA in German 0720 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—The clashes between demonstrators and security forces in Tbilisi from Saturday night to Sunday morning claimed at least 30 to 50 lives, according to civil rights activist circles in Moscow and in Tbilisi itself. According to official Soviet sources, 16 people died when special troops broke up a rally.

A member of the banned "National Democratic Party of Georgia" in Tbilisi told DPA on the telephone that at least 50 people were killed when Rustaveli Square was stormed by troops. Staff of Moscow civil rights activist Sergey Girgoryants spoke of 30 dead, based on Georgian sources. The troops exhibited great brutality.

As civil rights activists at Tbilisi and Moscow went on to say, the Interior Ministry units transferred from outside of Georgia to Tbilisi and used batons and sharp-edged pioneer spades against the demonstrators. "They did not behave like humans, but like animals," said a member of the banned National Democratic Party of Georgia, who would not be identified. Referring to Georgian newspaper editor (Viktor Rzcheladse), Moscow civil rights activists let it be known that many of the dead showed signs of shovel blows to the head. The troops began storming the square at 0400 on Sunday morning, it was said. Accompanied by four tanks and four armored personnel carriers, they moved against the demonstrators in formation. The first wave was armed with batons, the second with spades.

According to these sources, the Georgian militia was disarmed. Nevertheless, they tried to protect the people, it was said. There is no more detailed information at present. There was shooting in the city center and near the polytechnic.

Strikes are said to be on in many Tbilisi works and in other parts of Georgia. Public transport is halted. Black flags were hanging on all houses in the capital as a sign of mourning. The militia has arrested many leaders of

banned national organizations and is searching for other members. Those arrested included: Irina Sarishvili, Georgi Chanturia, Zviad Gamsakhurdia, and Merab Kostava.

Foreign Journalists Banned From Georgia

AU1004083889 Paris AFP in English 0813 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, April 10 (AFP)—Foreign journalists are forbidden to enter Georgia, the Soviet Foreign Ministry said Monday,

A curfew has been in force since Sunday in the southern republic's capital Tbilisi, scene of clashes between Interior Ministry troops and Georgian nationalist demonstrators in which 16 people were reported killed and up to 200 injured.

Residents in Tbilisi said Sunday that the 16 died when security forces moved in with metal batons and tear gas to clear demonstrators outside the government administration building in Tbilisi.

The troops charged "thousands" of people gathered for the fourth day outside the government building around about 100 hunger strikers calling for Georgian independence, the residents said. [passage omitted]

Further Gunfire Heard 10 Apr

AU1004104189 Paris AFP in English 1032 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Excerpt] Moscow, April 10 (AFP)—Shots were heard early Monday in Tbilisi, the Georgian capital paralysed by strikes and under curfew since Sunday when up to 30 people were killed in clashes between troops and nationalist demonstrators, according to unofficial tallies.

The shots were heard outside the university where, according to a local journalist reached by telephone, local intellectuals had planned to stage a rally.

The journalist with the local paper MOLODEZH GRUZII told AFP the shots could have been warning fire.

Quoting hospital sources, the journalist said 22 bodies had been counted, including those of several girls, following clashes late Saturday early Sunday between troops and nationalist demonstrators.

A list naming 30 dead was posted outside Tbilisi cathedral, local people said.

Troops are now stationed along all major roads in the city, while black flags are hanging from windows all over town.

The journalist said the demonstrations were entirely spontaneous. Nothing was organised but everyone was now overwhelmed by events. The official statement issued Sunday justifying the troops' action had made the situation even more tense, the journalist said. [passage omitted]

Leadership Bodies Extend Condolences

PM1004093989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Apr 89 Second Edition p 1

[Message on disturbances in Tbilisi: "From the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] A group of people, including civilians and servicemen, suffered as a result of efforts to halt disturbances provoked by extremist, antisocial elements in Tbilisi, in the square in front of Government House, on the night of 8-9 April. Some 16 people died in the crush.

The CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers express profound condolences to the families, relatives, and friends of the dead.
[Signed] CPSU Central Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and USSR Council of Ministers.

Georgian Party Bureau Debates Abkhaz Situation

PM1004104989 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 27 Mar 89 p 1

[Unattributed report: "At Georgian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] A session of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau has been held to discuss the question of the political situation in the republic in the light of recent events in the Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]. The bureau voiced its negative attitude toward the resolution and appeal of the rally of representatives of a part of the Abkhaz population of the autonomous republic in Lykhny Village, Gudautskiy Rayon, 18 March 1989 as contradicting the spirit of the decisions of the 27th party congress and the instructions of the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference.

The bureau session stressed that the proposal to change the status of the Abkhaz ASSR is unacceptable, does not accord with the interests of the region's socioeconomic and cultural development or the constitutional and legal bases of national-state building in the USSR, and fails to consider the realities of the political situation or the opinion of the non-Abkhaz inhabitants of the Abkhaz ASSR, who now comprise the overwhelming majority of its population, or the opinion of all working people of the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR], to which it belongs with the rights of an autonomous republic.

The bureau denounced attempts to resolve complex political questions affecting the interests of the entire multinational population of the Georgian SSR, wherever they may come from, through strong-arm pressure on party and soviet organs, including at meetings and spontaneous gatherings or during unauthorized marches and demonstrations. The only way of raising and resolving urgent problems of sociopolitical life is their calm, open [glasnoye], democratic discussion on a constitutional basis, in a spirit of constructive dialogue, mutual respect, and realism.

The party and state have elaborated a strategic line for improving interethnic relations which will receive all-around, comprehensive development at the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum devoted to this issue. Attempts to ignore existing legal norms and constitutional principles and ultimatums of any kind lead only to the aggravation of interethnic relations and the slowing down of the pace of restructuring and democratic transformations in the republic and throughout the country.

It was decided that the question of the situation which has taken shape since the events in the Abkhaz ASSR and of the actions of some leaders of the autonomous republic's party and soviet organs in this atmosphere should be specially examined at the very next session of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau.

PRAVDA Reports Abkhazia Leadership Change

PM0704140389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Plenum Held"]

[Text] Sukhumi, 6 Apr—An Abkhaz Georgian Communist Party Oblast Committee [obkom] plenum was held today to examine an organizational question.

The plenum relieved B.V. Adleyba of his duties as party obkom first secretary. V.F. Khishba, who had worked as first deputy chairman of the Georgian SSR State Committee for Environmental Control and Forestry, was elected first secretary of Abkhaz Georgian Communist Party Obkom.

The plenum was addressed by D.I. Patiashvili, first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee. V.A. Mikhaylov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee State Law Department, took part in the plenum's work.

Soviet Supreme Court Discusses Decree on Rallies

LD1004063889 Moscow TASS Service in Russian 0600 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Right now a plenum of the USSR Supreme Court is getting under way in Moscow. Following appeals [protesty] from the procurator general and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, a significant number of civil and criminal cases will be reviewed. A significant number of these concern the rehabilitation of people who were unlawfully repressed during the period of the Stalin personality cult. Also to be discussed is the matter of the practicalities of applying the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium decree on the procedure for the organization and holding of assemblies, rallies, street processions, and demonstrations in the USSR. The plenum will last four days.

Supreme Soviet Changes Anti-State Agitation Law

LD0904145689 Moscow TASS in English 1433 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS—The Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted on Saturday a decree on introducing changes and amendments to the USSR law "on criminal responsibility for crimes against the state" and to some other Soviet legislative acts.

A report circulated here today said that, in accordance with the decree, public appeals for undermining and overthrowing the Soviet state and social system, as well as the publication or circulation of materials containing such ideas shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to three years or by a fine of up to 2,000 roubles. The same actions committed repeatedly, or by an organised group of people, or with the use of copying facilities, shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to seven years or a fine of up to 5,000 roubles. The same actions committed on the instruction of foreign organisations shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term from three to ten years.

Deliberate actions aimed at kindling inter-ethnic or racial hostility and the restriction of citizens' rights depending on their race or nationality shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 roubles. The same actions combined with violence and deception, or committed by an official shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to five years or a fine of up to 5,000 roubles. The actions committed by a group of people or involving grave consequences shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to ten years.

Appeals for high treason, for the staging of an act of terrorism or subversion shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 roubles.

Public insults or the discrediting of the USSR supreme bodies of state power and government, as well as other state bodies formed by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet, or officials who are appointed, elected or approved by the Congress of People's Deputies or the USSR Supreme Soviet, as well as of public organisations operating in conformity with the Constitution shall be punishable by imprisonment for a term of up to three years or a fine of up to 2,000 roubles.

The Presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of union republics have been assigned the task of bringing the legislation of union republics in conformity with the present decree.

The decree of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet comes into force on the day of its publication.

Supreme Soviet Adopts Decree on Land Leasing

LD0804115489 Moscow TASS in English 1144 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS—A new decree passed by the USSR Supreme Soviet allows the lending of land, equipment, buildings and other property for 50 years and more. The decree is published in Sunday's newspapers.

The decree included proposals advanced at a plenary meeting of the Communist Party Central Committee last month. The plenum which discussed the party's agrarian policy set the task of changing relations of property in rural areas. It described the leasing system as one of the decisive ways to restructure these relations.

The decree creates legal guarantees of leasing not only in agriculture but also in other economic sectors. It allows the long-term leasing—up to 50 years and more—of land, natural resources, the property of enterprises and individual workshops, buildings, farm machinery, vehicles, cattle and other material values.

The decree allows both collective and individual leasing. It stipulates that persons engaged in individual labour activities in agriculture (Let it be called a family farm, to put it more clear) are given land with due account of farm members' ability to cultivate it.

The decree also determines other legal aspects of leasing: the content of leasing contracts, the procedures for their conclusion and annulment, rents, and the responsibilities of contracting sides.

The new decree is an experimental document. The government has been instructed to analyse the experience of the leasing movement in the Soviet Union and results of the decree's implementation and draft a law on leasing and leasing relations in the country.

This law is expected to be submitted to parliament in the middle of next year.

Leasing Decree To Be Published

LD0804170889 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 8 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR has adopted a decree on leasing and lease relations in the USSR. The Council of Ministers of the country has adopted a decision on the economic and organisational bases of lease relations in the USSR and the relevant clauses have been confirmed.

The text of the document will be published in the press.

Second Round of People's Deputy Elections Begins

Elections Set for 9 Apr

LD0804074389 Moscow TASS in English 0701 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 8 TASS—The Soviet Union is seized by another round of election frenzy with posters virtually everywhere and various initiative groups rallying support for their candidates in the streets.

The country is bracing up for the second ballot scheduled in the Soviet Union's 64 undecided territorial and national-territorial constituencies on Sunday, April 9.

These electoral districts had three or more candidates running for the new Congress of People's Deputies in the March 26 elections. None of them won the necessary 50 percent of the vote and now only the top two candidates will be included in the ballot. A candidate who wins the majority in the second polling will become deputy, under the revamped Soviet electoral law which sets two weeks to hold another ballot after the initial voting.

A total of 1,958 of 2250 seats to the new Soviet legislature have been filled, according to the statistics of the Central Election Commission released on April 4. 590 seats were filled in 750 territorial constituencies and 636—in 750 national-territorial districts and 732 seats were filled by the Soviet public organisations from 750 allocated them under the current election system. Of the elected deputies 17.1 percent are women, 18.6 percent—workers, 11.2—farm workers and 87.6 are Communist Party members.

In 113 territorial and 82 national-territorial constituencies where none of one of two fielded candidates captured more than half of the listed voters on March 26, new election campaigns are being waged with new elections scheduled for May 14.

Under the electoral law, new elections will also be held in constituencies where the results were nullified. This happened in one territorial and two national-territorial constituencies in Armenia where less than a half of registered voters participated. A second round of elections will also be held in five public organisations to decide the unfilled 18 seats in April-May.

A second ballot will be held in 8 of 26 territorial districts in Moscow. Noted writer Yuriy Chernichenko, Professor of Philosophy Gennadiy Ashin, historian Roy Medvedev and Kseniya Razumova, laboratory chief at the Institute of Nuclear Energy, are among those running in Moscow.

Voters Urged To Turn Out

PM0804161789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Apr 89 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "Voting Once Again!"]

[Text] The election of USSR people's deputies was held in our country 2 weeks ago. Public organizations nominated their representatives to the supreme organ of power even earlier. The progress and results of the election campaign are being widely discussed by Soviet people.

Most opinions amount to saying that voters displayed passionate civic interest in the election of their representatives to the country's body of deputies.

Today the polling booths of those okrugs where not one out of three or more candidates was able to secure victory 26 March are awaiting voters for a runoff. The contest is now to be between two candidates. But a result is possible on one condition only, namely, that at least half the voters on the electoral register cast their vote. So it is "Everyone to the Polls!" in those few dozen okrugs where a runoff is to be held.

Polls 'Opened Early' 9 Apr

LD0904042989 Moscow TASS in English 0422 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 9 TASS—Polling stations opened early today in 64 territorial and national-territorial electoral districts across the country for another round of elections to the country's Congress of People's Deputies.

Three or more deputies were registered in them earlier but none of them scored more than half of all the ballots on March 26 and thus none was elected. In the second round the two who got the most ballots in March will run again. The one who gets more ballots will be considered elected.

Last Sunday, the second round was staged in 12 out of 76 districts requiring re-run but the final returns have not yet been published.

According to data of the central electoral board, in the course of the March 26 ballot and earlier elections in public organisations, deputies were elected to fill 1,958 out of 2,250 seats in the congress.

Women make up 17.1 per cent of the elected. Workers—18.6 per cent. Collective farmers—11.2 per cent. 87.6 per cent are Communist Party members.

"The people have come to feel that they are granted a practical opportunity to influence the election outcome by nominating the best," chairman of the central electoral board Vladimir Orlov told TASS.

"Candidates were nominated not for their ranks or trumpeted promises but for their high moral standards and ability to contribute to the restructuring drive," Orlov said.

Another round of elections will take place on May 14 in 113 territorial and 82 national-territorial electoral districts where candidates ran unopposed or with one opponent with none getting the required majority.

In these districts the process of nomination, registration and campaigning will re-start from scratch. In accordance with the election law, another round of elections will take place also in districts where the March 26 elections were declared null and void, as in one territorial and two national-territorial districts in Armenia where less than half of the registered voters turned out for the ballot. A re-run is also scheduled for April and May in five public organisation to elect 18 deputies.

89.8 per cent of the voters took part in the elections on March 26, Orlov said. No one was prodded to come this time. "People were motivated in coming to the polling stations by their sense of responsibility for the fate of perestroyka and for those to whom they entrust the affairs of state," Orlov said.

The interest in the new round of elections is keen again. You can see leaflets and posters on house walls, supporters can be seen campaigning in the streets.

Medvedev, Others Elected Deputies

LD1004052189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] [Announcer] On Sunday 9 April, runoff elections were held in 64 constituencies around the country. These included eight in Moscow. The counting began there in the evening and only ended late at night. Our correspondent Leonid Lazarevich was in the Gagarinskiy Territorial Constituency of Moscow during the counting. Here is his report:

[Begin recording] Ninety minutes ago the polls closed. I saw the members of the ward electoral commission emptying the ballots from the ballot box onto the table. They took maximum care over every single ballot. Somehow the counting of ballots still took considerably less time than 2 weeks ago, on 26 March. This is only to be expected: On the one hand there have been only two candidates, and on the other hand the ward electoral commission now has more experience.

And now I am reporting from the constituency electoral commission. Representatives of the ward electoral commissions are arriving here to hand in the ballots and the documentation.

[Poznyak] My name is Poznyak. I am chairman of ward electoral commission No 3 for Gagarinskiy Rayon.

[Boykova] I am Boykova, secretary of ward electoral commission No 3.

[Lazarevich] You know, I was at one of the polling stations, and I got the feeling that voting was no lighter than on 26 March. Or so it seemed.

[Poznyak] No, it was a little lighter. In percentage terms, 77.4 percent of registered voters voted just now.

[Lazarevich] At the polling station where I was, more than 80 percent of the voters turned out.

[Poznyak] Yes, the turnout was quite heavy.

[Lazarevich] I realize that the results of the voting are still being collated here in the constituency electoral commission, but who received the most votes at your polling station?

[Poznyak] Our preliminary calculations show Chernichenko.

[Lazarevich] By a convincing majority?

[Boykova] A convincing one.

[Lazarevich] But we will wait and see. The constituency electoral commission is still working.

And now the representatives of the last ward electoral commissions—from Solntsevskiy Rayon—have arrived. Now the calculation of the votes is going on, the final figures are being generated. And now an interview with Lyudmila Georgiyevna Shpagina, secretary of the constituency electoral commission. Lyudmila Georgiyevna, first and most importantly: Who has been returned as a USSR people's deputy?

[Shpagina] Yuriy Dmitriyevich Chernichenko, a commentator on central television.

[Lazarevich] A well-known writer on current affairs. How many people voted for him?

[Shpagina] Some 67.7 percent of those who cast their votes voted for him.

[Lazarevich] I get the impression that the runoff election went rather more smoothly than on 26 March. You seem to have worked faster and better.

[Shpagina] Yes, we had the same impression. Clearly our experience has helped. Presumably it is going to improve with each election. We are pleased with the results today.

[Announcer] The preliminary data that we have received from the Moscow city soviet indicate that other people's deputies of the USSR include: Yuriy Imanuelovich Andreyev, Roy Aleksandrovich Medvedev, Viktor Nikolayevich Yaroshenko, Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov, Andrey Yevgenyevich Sebentsov, Yuriy Vladimirovich Skokov, and Sergey Borisovich Stankevich.

Moscow District Elections Reported

LD1004095389 Moscow TASS in English 0930 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 10 TASS—By TASS correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov:

Soviet historian Roy Medvedev, publicist Yuri Chernichenko and another six people were elected USSR people's deputies on Sunday as a result of the runoff elections in eight territorial electoral districts of the Soviet capital.

A TASS correspondent was told in the Central Electoral Commission that 67.1 per cent of the voters had taken part in the polling.

The six newly-elected deputies are Sergei Stankevich, a scientific worker at the Institute of General History of the USSR Academy of Sciences, Viktor Yaroshenko, deputy general director of the tractor building scientific and production amalgamation, Yuriy Ryzhov, rector of the Moscow Aviation Institute, Yuriy Andreyev, chief engineer at a design institute, Andreiy Sebentsov, departmental chief at the Prozhektor plant, and Yuriy Skokov, general director of the Kvant scientific and production amalgamation.

Under the new electoral law, run-off elections are held in those electoral districts where three or more candidates stood but none of them polled more than a half of the vote necessary to win, as was the case on March 26.

The names of two candidates who polled the largest number of votes are included in ballot papers. Elected as a result of the second round is the one who gets a majority vote. The law assigns a period of two weeks for run-off elections which were held in 12 districts of the country on April 2 and in the remaining 64 on Sunday.

A completely new round of elections will be held in 199 electoral districts in the Soviet Union on May 14—195 districts where one of two deputies stood and none of them was able to poll more than a half of the vote as well as in three Armenian electoral districts where the March 26 polling was found invalid because less than a half of the registered voters took part in the polling. A new round of election is also to be held in one district where the elected deputy died soon after the polling.

The nomination and registration of candidates in all these districts will be held anew fully in accordance with the law but within shorter time limits. A repeated election will also be held in April-May in five public organisation where 18 vacancies are yet to be filled.

Losing Kraykom Secretary Views Poll Lessons

PM1004101289 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
7 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 3

[Interview with V.S. Pasternak, first secretary of Khabarovsk CPSU Kray Committee (Kraykom), by Valeriy Vyzhutovich: " 'For' and 'Against'"; date and place of interview not given; first two paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Excerpts] He spent the night of 26-27 March in the office. While they counted and recounted the votes, he waited, in an agony of suspense. At 0400 hours the door opened and an apparatus worker came in. Pasternak asked: "How many?" On hearing that he had won only one-third of the votes, he did not hide his distress; then he looked at his watch: "Well, time to get some sleep!" He said good-bye and went home.

That night, he could not sleep....

[Vyzhutovich] Things look different in the morning, Viktor Stepanovich. So now, a few days after that sleepless night, let us try to assess the situation calmly and dispassionately. You were not elected. That cannot, of course, be very pleasant for you, but I do not think it is a tragedy, either. A contest is a contest, someone always loses. But why are you not among the winners?

[Pasternak] To understand that, it is necessary to analyze my election campaign and answer a great many "whys."

[Vyzhutovich] Are there useful discoveries to be made?

[Pasternak] Yes, many. [passage omitted]

[Vyzhutovich] What questions were you asked most often?

[Pasternak] Nearly everywhere, especially after the Central Committee March (1989) plenum, I was asked if I know Yeltsin and what I think about him.

I replied: I have known Boris Nikolayevich quite a long time. He came here to our kray when he was a CPSU Central Committee secretary. When I was chief of the CPSU Central Committee Transport and Communications Department and he was Moscow City Committee [gorkom] first secretary, we racked our brains over how to improve transport in the capital. Boris Nikolayevich is, I think, a good organizer and a man of principle, but in the political sphere too much of a maximalist. Here we differ, although I am sure his speech at the Central Committee October (1987) plenum should have been published immediately, so as to stop the rumors and misunderstandings.

That is my personal view, and I expressed it directly and unequivocally. In general, I am convinced there can be no monopoly on the truth. Lenin himself used to criticize the practice of the apparatus dictating its will to the party. The apparatus exists for politics, not politics for the apparatus—that was his principle. That is why many Communists endowed with power conducted their election battles in such a free, unfettered manner, and I hope I myself said whatever I thought.

[Vyzhutovich] All the same, it misfired. Is it, perhaps, not only a question of how you conducted the campaign and what people think of you personally, but something else?

[Pasternak] It must be said frankly that others had a hand in these election results—Brezhnev, Rashidov, Kunayev, Medunov, and hundreds of "minor princes" who treated oblasts and rayons like their private patrimonies. Arrogance, bureaucracy, bribery, links with the criminal world—these "virtues" were characteristic of some party figures, including, to be frank, some in our kray. But it is not only a question of abuses. People are tired of commands and orders, sick of diktat by the apparatus, repelled by officials who place private interests—often their own selfish interests—above the party's political interests. As the leader of a kray party organization—and I have been in this post only 6 months—I sometimes find it very difficult to establish normal contact with people; I come up against caution, mistrust, hostility: All of you, they say, are tarred with the same brush.... The people have seen so much that it now takes tremendous efforts by every one of us to regain their trust—not in the party, they still trust the party, but in us, every one of us personally. And you cannot do that overnight. Whatever may be the case elsewhere, in our kray the legacy of stagnation is as rich and diverse as nature itself is around here. So in voting against me, people were voting against the feckless order of things that prevailed here over many years.

[Vyzhutovich] I remember Khabarovsk in July 1986. At that time I was one of a group of journalists covering M.S. Gorbachev's tour of the Far East. At that time much human rage against the kray's top leaders was poured out at meetings and talks between the general secretary and the inhabitants of Khabarovsk, Komsomolsk-na-Amure.... The social tension was almost tangible.

[Pasternak] It has not yet entirely disappeared. It will take years and years to rectify the situation, and much, alas, is beyond repair. The cedar forests of the Ussuriysk taiga were cut down over the decades, spawning rivers were polluted by chemicals, rare breeds of animals and birds perished through poachers' rifles, and sometimes explosives.... Not a single well-appointed forestry workers' settlement, not a single industrial enterprise with modern resource-saving technology and working conditions. The omnipotence of ministries—and there are 50 or so of them here—and each pursues its own ends, not caring about the kray's needs. Territory is opened up and developed one-sidedly, there is a marked bias in favor of raw material extraction, but processing should be established too, rather than sending trainloads to the west. There is a major electricity shortage, an acute lack of

housing and food, the consumer sphere is as undeveloped as the primitive forest itself.... In part all this is the result of the policy of the center with regard to the Far East, but local leaders are held responsible. And they have been called to account. For other people's sins too.

[Vyzhutovich] But not only other people's, Viktor Stepanovich? You came to Khabarovsk recently after working at the CPSU Central Committee, that is true, but you are an indigenous inhabitant of the kray, and not an ordinary one, either. You were a rayon committee secretary, and a gorkom secretary, and chairman of the kray soviet executive committee....

[Pasternak] Yes, I was, I was a leader, I do not deny anything in my life story. I do not minimize my share of blame in everything that happened here, but I do not want to exaggerate it either. Sometimes I used to protest to Aleksey Klementyevich (Chernyy, then kraykom first secretary—V.V.) and argue with him at bureau meetings on questions of principle. But voters everywhere said with venom: "When did you become such a champion of restructuring?" This question is not, I think, very concrete, but it is legitimate, although if we are going to start grabbing one another by the lapels and shouting "and what did you do in the period of stagnation?!" we will only increase the mutual bitterness (which there is plenty of already), and the cause will not be advanced. A man's civic stance has always been very important, but what is particularly important is his way of thinking today, how far he understands and accepts restructuring.

[Vyzhutovich] I agree. Especially since we are talking about serious matters. The voters have to know who is who, so that they can be guided by that knowledge in the secret ballot booth, as they have indeed done....

[Pasternak] All the same, the election contest has to follow rules. After a meeting with voters at the Gorkiy Plant I was told, for instance, that the informal group "Trudoden" had been campaigning against me there for 3 days.

[Vyzhutovich] And was anyone apart from your agents voluntarily campaigning for you?

[Pasternak] After one "Trudoden" rally a youth support group set up at the Khabarovsk Railroad Transport Institute, where I studied and where I was nominated as a candidate people's deputy, issued a pamphlet by way of response. Listen to this: "We should have a real influence on the top party figure in our kray, including the possibility of depriving him of his deputy's seat and recalling him from the Supreme Soviet if he does not justify our confidence. We believe that a professional politician who has daily information available to him from the entire kray will be able to resolve our problems in the Supreme Soviet more intelligently and with more foundation. We call on you not to yield to emotion, but to make a thoughtful decision, with a view to our kray's future. Vote for CPSU Kraykom First Secretary Pasternak, Viktor Stepanovich!"

[Vyzhutovich] I see the pamphlet is properly printed....

[Pasternak] Yes, like numerous items campaigning for other candidates. You are suggesting that campaigning for a candidate who is first secretary of the party kraykom can be conducted on a bigger scale than campaigning against him? Then read a pamphlet published by anonymous authors: "To vote for Pasternak is to vote for the party that led our motherland into an impasse and now, with the help of demagogic flourishes, is trying to assure the people that it can lead the country out of this condition."

I do not even know which is more in evidence here—blind intolerance, or elementary political ignorance. Clearly some people are in a hurry to forget that it was the party that started restructuring and is leading it firmly and consistently. Incidentally, the slogans of nearly all the "champions" of restructuring are only rephrased propositions from the CPSU Central Committee election appeal! Not to see this and to turn it into a subject of political speculation is to lose all sense of reality. To say nothing of the moral side.

[Vyzhutovich] But did you not try to meet and talk with the "Trudoden" leaders, not, of course, at the kraykom, but on their territory?

[Pasternak] When I began work as kraykom first secretary and learned that a number of leaders of informal associations wanted to meet me, the meeting took place immediately, and on their "territory." One Saturday we were engaged in what was, in my view, a very interesting and lively discussion until late at night. I will make no secret of the fact that I have long wanted to meet with the "Trudoden" leaders, too, but this was an extremely busy period. But I was wrong not to meet with them; I realize that now. We are still very cautious about spontaneous informal groups; we try to channel them into an organized form. But in fact the soviets themselves originated with a spontaneous movement of the broad masses. Lenin noted the "spontaneous, natural formation of the soviets of workers' deputies" in 1905 and 1917. And did not a sharp rejection of stagnation, moral disintegration at all levels of the administrative system, and the social corrosion to which our lofty principles and ideals were subjected mature spontaneously in many of us? Of course, there are movements and movements. A good many demagogues and extremists have also surfaced on the wave of restructuring. Which makes it even more worthwhile to look carefully at the emerging groups and associations. I did not do that, and I regret it. I also made a number of tactical errors.

[Vyzhutovich] Like what, Viktor Stepanovich?

[Pasternak] Well, for instance, on meeting with voters I failed to clarify sufficiently my poliitcal position and my attitude to the reform of the state apparatus and other key questions of restructuring; instead, I was immediately drawn into a discussion of consumer and social needs. I feel, and not without reason, that one should talk first and foremost about those things that concern people urgently in their daily life, upset them, and poison their lives. And so it began.... Apartment repairs, the demolition of dilapidated housing, the operation of urban transportation, dirty streets, heaps of garbage.... I tried to answer all these questions thoroughly and in detail, until at one plant an angry man stood up: "Well, now you see who claims the deputy's seat. But we are not supposed to be electing a municipal services leader, but our representative to the highest organ of state power, where the strategic tasks of running the country are resolved." Touche, as they say! I learned my lesson: People are beginning to feel like citizens, and the course of the political reform and large-scale transformations in the economy concern them no less, and sometimes more, than a leaky roof.

[Vyzhutovich] What is your attitude to party leaders who lost in the elections? The editorial office is receiving telephone calls and telegrams. Some people think that organizational conclusions should ensue, or that the loser should resign of his own accord. Others, on the contrary, regard this outcome as a normal, democratic phenomenon and wish the party secretaries success at the forthcoming elections to local soviets.

[Pasternak] I think the latter are right. Being elected to the Supreme Soviet is not an end in itself. A deputy's seat will not help some party leaders, while others will not be hindered by the lack of it.

[Vyzhutovich] Incidentally, this is a question that often arose in the course of the election campaign: Is a deputy's seat really necessary for the first secretary of a republic Communist Party Central Committee, kraykom, or oblast committee?

[Pasternak] I think a major party official not only can, but should seek to be elected as a USSR people's deputy. In these circumstances a kraykom first secretary becomes constitutionally obliged to give an account of his activity not only to the party apparatus, but to ordinary voters. And without such accountability it will be hard for us to progress toward the creation of a rule-of-law state.

[Vyzhutovich] When the election results were announced and it became clear that a number of top party leaders had not been elected, it was tempting, as always, to seek someone to blame. And in some places the finger of wrath is already pointing at the press: It "whipped up passions," "cast aspersions," "undermined prestige"....

[Pasternak] I do not think the press has anything to do with it. We ourselves, at least many of us, have not yet learned to take advantage of its support and potential; we have not yet learned to be political leaders. We do not always know how to conduct dialogue with people on equal terms; we have not acquired the capacity to sensitively perceive the mood and heed public opinion. It is time to come out of our offices and go and seek support among the country's ordinary citizens, whose trust, as 26 March showed, has gone up immeasurably in value.

I was not elected.... Well, as a man I am disappointed, I cannot deny it, and I will probably be reliving this sad fact for a long time to come. But as a party leader committed to the profound democratization of our society, I must be pleased that for the first time in Soviet history there has been a true expression of the people's will, and they have at last made a free choice. Yes, some party officials lost the elections, but the party as a whole and its restructuring program secured a tremendous victory. After all, 87.6 percent of the USSR people's deputies elected are Communists. As the illustrious poet whose name I share said: "I am vanquished by them all, and therein lies my victory."

Russian Republic Presidium Views Election Outcome

PM1004102789 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 7 Apr 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "At the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Supreme Soviet Presidium: In the Light of the Demands of Restructuring"]

[Text] The elections of USSR people's deputies have produced quite a few surprises. One of them is that they are not finished. In many electoral okrugs runoffs or repeat elections will have to be held. However, right now, soviets at all levels are analyzing the course of the election campaign and its results in the light of recent events. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet is an example of this. A session of its Presidium held 5 April discussed the results of the elections of USSR people's deputies on RSFSR territory.

It was noted that, by their votes, Soviet people convincingly demonstrated support for the policy of the Communist Party and the course of restructuring, democracy, and broad glasnost. The election campaign revealed the working people's increased political activeness, openness in the expression of public opinion, and citizens' commitment to electing the worthiest people as USSR people's deputies. The CPSU Central Committee Appeal to the Party and the Soviet People had a great impact on the whole course of the election campaign.

In the RSFSR, elections were held in 646 electoral okrugs, where 1,238 candidates ran for USSR people's deputy. More than 90 million of the over 104 million voters in the RSFSR, or 87.0 percent, took part in the elections.

In the RSFSR, 935 people were elected USSR people's deputies: 301 from territorial electoral okrugs, 198 from national-territorial okrugs, and 436 from social organizations. Candidates in 147 RSFSR electoral okrugs failed to secure the requisite number of votes. In 110 okrugs repeat elections are to be held, and in 37 runoffs will take place.

Comprehensively examining the election results, the session participants did not sidestep critical issues which arose in the course of the election campaign and during the elections themselves, noting shortcomings and omissions. It was stated that certain local soviet executive committeess [ispolkoms] did not make full use in practice of the democratic approaches to the solution of specific election campaign questions which are enshrined in the Law on Elections of USSR People's Deputies. In some places okrug and ward electoral commissions were formed in the old fashion. Specifically, they included virtually no representation of voters based on places of residence. Individual okrug electoral commissions made poor use of their rights to take control of the election preparations. Not everywhere was the necessary explanatory work done among voters about the voting procedure itself. As a result, more than 5 million ballot papers were spoiled or ruled invalid. All this indicates that many soviet organs proved unready for the new realities of election preparation work.

Questions pertaining to the practical implementation of the new legislation on elections were thoroughly analyzed. Why are there few workers, women, and representatives of indigenous nationalities among the elected deputies? All this furnishes food for thought and reflects shortcomings in the work of local soviets. The session participants made a principled assessment of those local soviets which behaved passively or did not make full use of their potential for meeting voters' requests and proposals.

Soviets at local level are instructed to elaborate practical measures aimed at further improving the work of their executive and decisionmaking [rasporyaditelnyy] organs. The closest attention is to be paid in the republic to voters' mandates.

The Presidium session discussed the question of the implementation in the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet 7 July 1987 resolution "On the Work of RSFSR Soviets of People's Deputies Pertaining to Voters' Mandates." It was emphasized that in accordance with voters' mandates many residential homes, children's preschool establishments, schools, hospitals, consumer service centers, and stores had been built in the autonomous republic, and work to supply gas to apartments and build water mains and heat supply lines to population centers had been carried out—which contributed to the consolidation of the material and technical base of the social sphere and to the solution of many questions connected with the improvement of people's working and leisure conditions and therefore of vital importance to them.

In a whole series of cases voters themselves participated directly in the work of carrying out mandates. With their assistance 5,705 mandates were implemented, connected mainly with the provision of amenities at population centers.

At the same time, on-the-spot investigations by deputies and the discussion in the Presidium revealed that soviet and economic organs in the autonomous republic have still not fulfilled many of the voters' mandates and have failed to adopt a sufficiently exacting attitude toward leaders of state organs who are responsible for their implementation. Attention has slackened with respect to mandates connected with the construction of purification installations at rural cultural centers, vocational and technical schools, automatic telephone exchanges, and other social sphere establishments.

Effective monitoring of the utilization of means and resources allocated by enterprises under union jurisdiction for the implementation of voters' mandates has not been established in the republic. The ispolkoms and standing commissions of a number of soviets are showing insufficient activeness in this matter.

In its resolution, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium instructs the Bashkir ASSR Supreme Soviet Presidium and Council of Ministers and local soviets of people's deputies to adopt additional measures to ensure the fulfillment of voters' mandates accepted for implementation, and to involve labor collectives, social organizations, and the republic's population more actively in this work.

Progress in the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry's implementation of recommendations from standing commissions and of deputies' proposals submitted at the 9th Session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation was also discussed at the Presidium session.

It was noted that the RSFSR Ministry of Light Industry has not implemented the standing commission recommendations or the suggestions and recommendations submitted by RSFSR Supreme Soviet deputies in full. The population's demand for many types of light industry goods is still not being met, especially as regards clothing and footwear for children and older people, ladies' winter coats, ladies woollen and silk dresses, men's suits and shirts, and leather and felt footwear.

And, what is more, enterprises under the jurisdiction of the said ministry are planning to reduce the production of a number of these goods against the 1988 plan.

A substantial number of enterprises continue to produce low-quality output for which there is no demand, and they are slow to update the range of their goods. The production of expensive goods continues to develop faster than the production of cheap goods, while the "erosion" of the latter continues. The ministry's enterprises have not adopted sufficient measures to ensure enhanced production efficiency, better utilization of existing production facilities, and accelerated assimilation of newly commissioned production capacities. New forms of labor organization and progressive technological processes are being introduced too slowly. Little attention is being paid to improving labor collectives' social and living conditions.

In the adopted resolution the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium draws the attention of the RSFSR Light Industry to the need to adopt additional measures to implement the recommendations of the standing commissions and deputies' proposals.

The RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium approved a plan of key measures to be implemented at the RSFSR Supreme Soviet during the second quarter of the current year and discussed a number of questions pertaining to the election of RSFSR court judges, individual oblast court judges, and Moscow and Leningrad city court judges.

Other questions pertaining to the republic's state affairs were discussed.

The session was chaired by T.G. Ivanova, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium.

Yeltsin Car Crash Rumors Denied by Assistant

PM0704123289 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 4

[V. Vasilyev response to readers' queries under the general heading "You Phoned Us"]

[Text] "Is it true that B.N. Yeltsin has been in a car crash?" L. Timakova, Moscow City

"Is it true that B.N. Yeltsin has been run over?" A. Rublevskiy, Gorkiy Oblast.

Lev Sukhanov, assistant to B.N. Yeltsin, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Construction [Gosstroy], reports that these unfounded rumors have been spreading for a long time. The phone at the Gosstroy front office has been ringing off the hook. Boris Nikolayevich has not been in any car crash. He is currently vacationing in Kislovodsk.

KGB Aids in Preventing Baku Hijack Attempt

18000762 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 2 Apr 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with R. Ishmiyarov by S. Ostanin: "The Moment Decided Everything"; date of interview not given; for related reports see the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT for 31 March, pp 55-56, and 4 April, pp 49-51]

[Text] A subdivision of the USSR KGB, which took part in foiling a hijacking of an airplane at the "Bina" airport in Baku, returned to Moscow. We had a brief conversation with the subdivision's manager, associate of the USSR Committee for State Security, Col R. Ishmiyarov, at the aircraft's steps.

"As you know, the operation to capture the criminal ended, successfully, without bloodshed. To be honest, the sense of the danger which threatened the lives of over 80 people is still in my heart. Imagine, our contacts with the criminal in the airplane indicated to us that he controlled some sort of device which he had in his sports bag.

"We were confident that a carefully weighed evaluation of the situation would ensure success. All the manifestations of minor details of the situation, newly gathered data on the signs and the actual behavior of the criminal were immediately reported to USSR KGB Headquarters, headed by KGB deputy chairman Lieutemant General V. Pirozhkov. Headquarters worked through the night without stopping. I would add that the noted specialist, Psychologist T. Dadashev from Azerbaijan, took part in the evaluation of the behavioral characteristics of the airplane hijacker.

"On 31 March, between 9 and 10 AM, the situation demanded our action. The criminal was extremely nervous, and began to threaten reprisals against the passengers. On the basis of our operation readiness report, KGB Headquarters in Moscow made the final decision to subdue the criminal.

"The operation's positive outcome on the scene essentially depended upon well-set-up interaction with other departments, first and foremost, with representatives of the Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and the Ministry of Civil Aviation. Incidentally, among the first to establish contact with the criminal, later participating in his capture, was USSR MVD responsible associate A. Aslakhanov."

On behalf of the editorial board I would add that in the tension of the situation, the operation conducted may be compared with a precise psychological game, a match of nerves. The Chekists had to psychologically study the opponent, understand his frame of mind, determine the motives for his behavior. The moment for calculated risk was not lost. The terrorist was surrounded as he let down his guard while lighting a cigarette.

Belorussian Heads Working Group on Republics

LD0804173189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Excerpts] [Announcer Yuliy Semenov] Many of you, comrades, have evidently read or heard information about the fact that a working group of the country's Supreme Soviet deputies has been created and is operating on the preparation of proposals on the delimitation of the responsibilities of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the republics themselves. It has also been reported that Comrade Tarazevich, the chairman of the Belorussian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet Presidium, is heading the group. [passage omitted]

I think that the issue of a clearer delimitation of the responsibilities of the union and the republics has now been placed on the agenda by the very course of the democraticization of society, by the development of interethnic relations, and by the strengthening of the legal principles of our lives.

It seems to us that this problem is of interest to people of any nationality, to residents of any republic. So we decided to address the leader of the working group of deputies of the country's Supreme Soviet. We telephoned Georgiy Stanislavovich Tarazevich in Minsk, congratulated him on his election as a people's deputy of the USSR, and arranged an interview. Aleksey Zhug, our correspondent in Belorusia, met him. First and foremost he asked Georgiy Stanislavovich to describe the initial boundaries, as it were, and the organization of the work of the group of deputies.

[Begin recording] [Tarazevich] It will be well known that the necessity for such a decision arose in connection with the fact that the delimitation currently operating on the duties between the union and the republics is suffering from a number of serious shortcomings. First and foremost are excessive centralization, centralization of the system management for economic and socio-cultural construction, the inexactness of the legislative definition of the duties of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and the subject of the socialist federation.

It must be said that our group has not been working in isolation. All of the republics were represented. We received proposals from the supreme soviets of the republics, from their governments, from deputies, and from scientific establishments. Systematic consultations with scholars and with experts were also a significant help to us. Several sessions of the group have been held. In the intervals between the sessions the deputies and specialists sent in their observations and thoughts about the specific proposals which the group was elaborating. The deputies' group has basically completed its work. We have virtually unanimously worked proposals to delimit the rights of the union and the republic in the economic and socio-cultural spheres and in the area of state construction and legislation.

[Zhug] Georgiy Stanislavovich, could you please describe the main concepts which the group has worked out?

[Tarazevich] Yes, of course. We consider that the union's Constitution should state precisely the specific powers of the union, as represented by the its supreme organs of state power and administration, in all spheres of state, economic, and socio-cultural construction. In this connection the deputies came to the unanimous opinion that the union Constitution should contain an exhaustive list of all the powers of the union, and I stress exhaustive. That is, it should not contain any remissions [otsylka]. It should also be clearly defined that the republics have the right to decide any questions not ascribed by the Constitution and the laws of the USSR to the competence of the union. Here, we intended to observe the following principle: All the functions that can with more success and more efficiently be fulfilled by the center should be left to the center, but what can be better implemented without interference from the center should be transferred to the union republics. Georgiy Stanislavovich, what changes are to be seen in the sphere of state construction and legislation?

[Tarazevich] It is proposed that in virtually all spheres of legislation there will be republican codices or laws which will reflect the national—and also the economic, demographic and ecological—features of the region. It is also proposed that each union republic independently decide questions connected with the economic, cultural and other relations with other republics; this refers to horizontal relations, and not, as it was previously, when such relations were implemented only via union organs.

To protect the rights of the union republics from illegal interference by USSR central organs and primarily by ministries and departments, our group proposes that special legal mechanisms be elaborated; and I would like to stress that these are mechanisms which would make it possible to react effectively to every such incursion into a republic's competence.

[Zhug] What problems caused disagreement among the deputies and gave rise to the most heated discussions? Georgiy Stanislavovich, I would like to hear about the atmosphere in which the group operated, what things were like there.

[Tarazevich] I must say that the work of the group took place democratically; literally everyone had the opportunity to express his opinion. Pluralism of opinions was evident. All proposals were discussed attentively and we tried to reach unity. Therefore, naturally, there were disagreements, and I can even dwell on some of them a little. For example, some of the proposals contained demands that the redistribution of duties between the union and the republics should be carried out not by making changes in the union Constitution and current union legislation, but by means of concluding a new union contract which would then become part of the

USSR Constitution. Here, after discussions, we came to the conclusion that this would be incorrect. The contract form would have required the use of the principle of unanimity. That means it would have been sufficient for even one republic to firmly hold some special position on virtually any question and then it would be impossible to decide on that question. Therefore, we considered that it would be more reliable to discuss and resolve together the problem of delimiting the duties between the union and republics at the Congress of Peoples Deputies of the USSR in the normal constitutional procedure, and not using the procedure of a contract. This was the conclusion that was reached by the majority of deputies in our group.

In addition, an attempt was made recently to establish that union laws are valid on the territory of a particular republic only if they are sanctioned by the Supreme Soviet Presidium or by the Supreme Soviet of the appropriate republic. Such proposals, in essence, would have meant a move away from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a federal state, to a confederation. The majority of deputies in the group regarded such an approach negatively. Since our union is a sovereign union state and not just the sum of republics, the union laws should have supremacy over republican laws. This seems to us to be a general rule.

Finally, I would like to stress that our proposals are, of course, not indisputable. It would seem they need further discussion and possibly some corrections and further details. So this is not the end of the matter. Great and very serious discussion still lies ahead.

[Zhug] Thank you for the interview. Allow me to wish you success in the work of the deputies' working group. [end recording]

Norilsk Miners End Underground Sit-In

PM0904150589 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 9 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Common Sense Triumphs"]

[Text] Norilsk, Krasnoyarsk Kray— The working rhythm is being restored at the Norilsk Mining and Metallurgical Combine's mines. A few hours ago the last group of miners, who had spent 5 days below ground, refusing to start work, returned to the surface.

After the arrival in Norilsk of V.A. Durasov, USSR minister of nonferrous metallurgy, and I.I. Gladkiy, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, an agreement which provided for the satisfaction of the miners' basic demands was drawn up. But the action group put forward a new condition—a 30-percent increase in wages. It could not be met, however, owing to the Norilsk combine's switching over to new management conditions. And the strike continued.

V.A. Durasov and O.S. Shenin, first secretary of Krasnoyarsk CPSU Kray Committee [kraykom], issued an appeal to the workers and all working people of the city. The proposed terms, they assured the miners, would be carefully examined.

Common sense ultimately triumphed. Despite the stubborn resistance of a small group of miners who urged the continuation of the strike, the workers returned to the surface.

"We appreciated that our problems cannot be solved by a strike," Aleksandr Nemchenko, leader of a team of drill operators, told your TASS correspondent. "We could have put the whole combine in a difficult position by continuing it. The appeal by the leaders of the ministry and Krasnoyarsk Kraykom for us to start work convinced us of the need to seek new ways of settling the conflict."

"A considerable number of workers appreciated that to continue the conflict was to play into the hands of those people who wanted to exploit the strike for their own benefit," electrical mechanic Vasiliy Kolomiyets said, joining in our conversation. "And that did not form part of our plans."

It has been decided to analyze the prevailing situation at a conference of miners' labor collectives that will be held in the near future. The first hundreds of tonnes of ore went to Norilsk combine's metallurgical plants today.

Moscow Police Disarm Mental Patient, Defuse Bomb

PM0704163789 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 8

[G. Alimov report: "It Happened in the Evening...."]

[Text] Moscow Criminal Investigation Department staffers have rendered harmless a terrorist on the Sadovoye Koltso ring road in Moscow.

Moscow Criminal Investigation Department Chief A. Yegorov (a recent appointee to the post, by the way) has briefed your IZVESTIYA correspondent on the details of the operation.

"It happened the other day. At 1820 the city duty desk got a call from a driver from the No 5 Taxi Depot and was informed by him that his passenger was demanding that a meeting be arranged with foreign journalists. Otherwise, he threatened to blow up the car....

"Subunits of the Kievskiy Rayon Internal Affairs Administration and a special group from No 38 Petrovka Street [Ministry of Internal Affairs building] were dispatched to the scene, which was not far from Smolensk Square. It emerged from the conversation with the taxi driver that the unknown person had been holding a rucksack on his lap throughout the drive, from which protruded two wires which were taped to his

fingers. He cautioned the driver that if anyone other than foreign correspondents approached the car an explosion would be detonated without warning.

"The terrorist was reluctant to enter into any talks and the windows were kept closed. The busy street grew quiet—it had been necessary to block it off.

"Those involved in the operation had no option. They decided to to take the risk—to enter into contact with the unknown person.

"For reasons of professional secrecy I will not comment on how this was done," A. Yegorov said. "Lieutenant Colonel Anatoliy Nikolayevich Karpov executed this brilliantly. He approached the car with one of his staffers. After a moment he was allowed into the car. The talks lasted a long time—45 minutes. One could only guess what was happening. We subsequently learned that our staffer had so managed to win over the 'explosive-packing passenger' that he related his whole life story to him. Karpov then persuaded him to disconnect the wires to the explosive....

"The identity of the hijacker was established—he was A. Adushkin, born 1961, previously convicted for a crime against property for purposes of personal gain. He had been sent for compulsory treatment to a psychiatric hospital in the city of Irkutsk. He ran away. From the end of March he was the subject of a nationwide search.

"A home-made explosive device was discovered in the arrested man's rucksack. In specialists' opinion, its explosive force could have caused quite extensive damage."

Earthquake Registered in Soviet Far East

LD0904121489 Moscow TASS in English 1136 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Text] Magadan April 9 TASS—The seismic stations of Magadan Region (Soviet Far East) recorded an earthquake on the coast of the Sea of Okhotsk at 08:16 Moscow time, today.

According to preliminary data the magnitude of the quake at the epicentre which was 280 km west of Magadan, was 5-6 points on the 12-point scale.

The residents of Magadan felt an earth jolt with a magnitude of up to 3.5 points. There was no loss of life or damage.

Armenian Earthquake Commission Meets 1 April

PM0404104589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under the rubric "In the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission": "Program of Rural Construction on Agenda"]

[Text] Last year's natural disaster left its destructive traces in more than 300 Armenian villages. A special program was drawn up back in December to restore life to the full and to construct new villages and production projects. The USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee [Gosagroprom] was entrusted with implementing it. The progress in fulfilling this program's targets for the 1st quarter was examined at a regular conference of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission for Eliminating the Consequences of the Earthquake held in Yerevan 1 April. It was chaired by I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

It was pointed out that 108 construction detachments from all the union republics are now working in the countryside. More than 4,000 local inhabitants are also involved, construction workers are well supplied with equipment and machinery, and their material supply base and everyday conditions are improving.

Noteworthy in this regard is the approach and the resolution of this question by the Gosagroprom of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, whereby permanent dining rooms have been opened in places where people are stationed, trade in a wide range of foodstuffs and industrial goods has been organized, and subsidiary plots are being created. All this is the result of correctly understanding the complexity of the tasks and wishing to have reliable long-term rear services.

Planners, who have issued the already approved schemes of master plans for 228 villages, have also come up with positive aspects. All housing and public buildings are designed to withstand a force 9 earthquake.

Construction workers have fulfilled the targets for the 1st quarter, demolished and removed approximately 3,000 buildings, and repaired livestock units and projects in processing sectors.

Land reclamation workers are also keeping to schedule. Some 80,000 hectares of irrigated land have been prepared for watering in 14 rayons, pumping stations have been repaired, new water pipes have been laid, and a stable electricity supply has been ensured.

At the same time reconstruction and construction work is not being carried out rhythmically everywhere. During the past period it amounted to just 10 percent of the annual volume. The gosagroproms of Kazakhstan, Turkmenia, Estonia, and the Tajik and Georgian Soviet Socialist Republics are developing the work front only slowly.

The commission pointed to the inadmissibility of the USSR Gosagroprom's reducing the commissioning of projects against the target for this year, to delays over the allocation of plots of land by local soviet executive committees, and to unsatisfactory supplies of local construction materials.

It is proposed to fully man construction subdivisions with workers before 15 April, and to provide them with material resources to fulfill the 2d-quarter targets.

The commission also drew attention to the problem of enhancing the work efficiency of the republic's seismological service. Attaching great significance to comprehensiveness in resolving questions of earthquake forecasting and to the need to train cadres in this connection, and also with due regard for the standard of scientific research, experimental design developments, and the production of unique instruments at Yerevan State University, the commission supported a corresponding request from Spitakskiy Rayon party committee to create a geodynamic observatory and a national geological park in the fault zone.

The question of setting up an operational staff to eliminate the aftermath of the disaster in Kirovakan was examined. A.A. Pshenichnyy, USSR deputy minister of the coal industry, was appointed its leader.

S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the commission's work.

Shortcomings in Leninakan Construction, Plans Noted
PM0404153789 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission: Leninakan, Kirovakan: Today and Tomorrow"]

[Text] Can the outlines of the immediate future for Leninakan and Kirovakan be seen today? In part, yes. After all, the future and the fate of these major Armenian cities and of life itself in them are the concern of the entire country.

Large-scale work has been done over this period. One result of it is the elaboration of general plans drawn up following an in-depth and comprehensive study of world practice of construction in earthquake zones. This makes it possible to sharply increase the progress of the restoration work and to resolve many key issues.

The operational conference of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo Commission held in Yerevan 3 April and chaired by I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, examined the program for the immediate future of Leninakan and Kirovakan.

The commission analyzed in detail the progress of the work to restore central regions and build new residential areas in the cities. Reports were heard from senior workers at the Armenian State Committee for Construction [Gosstroy], the chairmen of Leninakan and Kirovakan Executive Committees, and the chiefs of staff of the Ukraine and Belorussia, who reported on the state of affairs on this question. There have been definite results in the development of design estimate and planning documentation, in engineering and geological surveys, in compiling seismic charts, and in investigating the technical standards of housing and public buildings. Disputes among scientists and specialists have been prompted by certain aspects of the general plan for Leninakan, which has been carried out by the "Yerevanproyekt" Institute. There have been particular disputes about the direction in which the new construction work is to develop. The local authorities favor a satellite city to the southeast, while the architects are against this idea. On the whole the commission accepted the architects' proposal with amendments and comments. There was criticism of the leaders of union sectors and city organs of power. A number of planning institutes have failed to meet the deadline for providing ready documentation for new projects and damaged buildings.

Territory has still not been set aside for 12,000 Ukrainian construction workers in Kirovakan, transportation on the Yerevan-Kirovakan railroad has not been organized, and the high-pressure gas pipeline, communications cables, and power lines have not been redirected—which is preventing the immediate construction of four housing projects in Kirovakan.

The commission instructed the republic Council of Ministers to ratify by 20 April the comprehensive program for Leninakan and Kirovakan within the limits of the total financing for the aforesaid work before the end of next year. In order to fully carry out this work, specialized repair and construction organizations are to be set up in these cities and given the functions of general subcontractor in these regions. The Armenian Gosstroy has been instructed to complete the development of detailed plans for the major "Marmashen" residential district in Leninakan by April, and the Main Administration for the Protection of Historical and Cultural Monuments has been instructed to provide a basis for the Kumayri architectural landmark area—the old center of this ancient city.

The shortcomings of the "Armpromstroymaterialy" Association in supplying inert materials for the growing volume of construction and restoration work were noted. The republic People's Control Committee was instructed to check by 15 April the work of the Oktemberyan Construction Materials and Articles Combine and the "Artiktuf" Association in the first quarter, and report the results of the check to the commission. S.G. Arutyunyan, first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the conference.

Earthquake Commission Sets Up Permanent Teams
NC0804152589 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 8 Apr 89

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] On its first page, the paper has published the following report from ARMENPRES: The Armenian Government commission on eliminating the earthquake's consequences held its regular session, and in

order to directly resolve the [word indistinct] problems in the earthquake zone, it set up permanently functioning work teams. In their ranks, these include the administrative staff of the republican ministries and supervisory boards. They are empowered to coordinate the work of local staff, to deal with the citizens who suffered from the earthquake, and to assume full responsibility for definitively resolving these citizens' social, employment, and other problems.

Armenian Construction Officials Reprimanded

NC0604151689 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 5 Apr 89

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] The Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers has criticized (Aruslamyan), deputy chairman of the republic's State Planning Committee, for his irresponsible attitude toward government decisions. As a result of this attitude the projected timetable for increasing local building material production were not met. The Council of Ministers demanded that (Aruslamyan) should take the necessary measures within a week so that the government's decisions may be implemented without delay.

The Council of Ministers also reprimanded (?Petrosyan), deputy chairman of the State Committee for Construction Affairs, and [name indistinct], deputy chairman of the main technology department of the State Committee for Construction Affairs production unit. The Council of Ministers warned them that unless they take measures to advance construction work in the earthquake zone within a week they will be relieved of their duties. An ARMENPRES report on the issue has been published on the first page of the paper.

Yerevan Commandant on 6 Apr Curfew Violations

NC0704131289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Statement by the military commandant of the Special District]

[Text] The situation in Yerevan and in other areas of the republic where curfew hours are in force is under the full supervision of the troops and organs of the Interior Ministry.

On 6 April, 36 people were detained and 12 cars were impounded in Yerevan for violating the curfew hours and for moving about without identity cards and personal documentation papers.

Ten people were detained for violating the curfew hours in other areas of the republic where the curfew is in force.

No incidents or crimes have occured in connection with enforcing the curfew requirements.

7 Apr Yerevan Curfew Violations

NC0804145789 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Statement by the military commandant of the Special District]

[Text] The situation in the republic's capital and in other areas where the curfew is in force is under the full supervision of the troops and organs of the Interior Ministry.

On 7 April, 56 people were detained and 30 cars impounded in Yerevan for violating the curfew and for moving about without identity cards or personal documentation papers.

8 Apr Curfew Violations

NC0904090089 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1600 GMT 8 Apr 89

[Statement by the military commandant of the Special District]

[Text] The republic's capital and those areas under curfew are being fully supervised by the Interior Ministry's troops and organs.

On 8 April, 26 people were detained and 19 cars were impounded in Yerevan for violating the curfew and for not carrying identity cards and personal documentation papers.

In those areas of the republic currently under curfew, 15 people were detained and 15 cars were impounded on 8 April for breaking the curfew.

No incidents have occurred in connection with enforcing the curfew.

Baku Commandant on 5 Apr Curfew Violations

NC0504114189 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0430 GMT 5 Apr 89

[Notice by the Military Commandant's Administration of the Baku City Special District]

[Text] The situation in Baku and in the republic as a whole has not changed. No violations of public law and order have been recorded.

A total of 92 individuals and 15 vehicles were detained for violating the curfew last night. Appropriate measures were taken against them on the spot.

[Signed] The military commandant's administration of the Baku City Special District.

Article on NKAO Refugees, Crime Criticized
NC0604172289 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0425 GMT 6 Apr 89

[From the review of SOVETAKAN AYASTAN]

[Text] On 15 March 1989 under the rubric "topical interview" KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA published an interview entitled "Extraordinary Assignment" with Viktor Ivanovich Ilyukhin, first deputy chief of the Administration of the USSR Procuracy General Inspectorate, by its correspondent Mursaliyev.

The reader will surely recall that the aforesaid interview basically refers to the current situation in the region regarding the refugee problems within the context of the introduction of a special form of administration in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. What is one to make of some of the principle flaws in the interview? Why has no objectivity been maintained in assessing the events, no with regard to chronology? This is the theme of the interview—published on the fourth page of the paper—that the ARMENPRES reporter conducted with Major General Arutunyan, Armenian SSR Internal Affairs minister.

Workers Urged To Assist Progress of Restructuring
PM0704132989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Apr 89 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Working People Control Restructuring"]

[Text] It is good that the tried and tested conviction that restructuring is taking place and will succeed if speeches, rallies, and the raising of various problems are followed by constructive and skillful practical work is becoming ever clearer and encompassing more and more strata of society. And restructuring is controlled by working people—workers, peasants, specialists, production management organizers, and figures in our science and technology. This idea was once again persistently voiced at the recent CPSU Central Committee meeting between the leaders of our party and representatives of the country's working class.

Everyone knows that discussions and gossip about our past mistakes and shortcomings also waste time. And not just spare time, but time intended for creative work. In the 4 years since restructuring started this is probably one reason why we have failed to accomplish a great deal, even though we have enjoyed more favorable conditions for rectifying matters in production. For instance, there is no shortage of talk about improving output quality and goods for the people in every possible way. We are into our second month of discussions on the draft law on this matter. What can we see in real life? This year around 2,500 of the country's leading enterprises are working to state acceptance. State inspectors in 18 major cities are accepting apartment blocks and social projects from construction workers. Nonetheless, in January alone the state acceptance system rejected at first submission industrial output worth R1.4 billion. This is 8 percent of total industrial output. In the machine building complex the figure is even higher—13.5 percent. Whereas 73,000 motor vehicles broke down during their warranty period in 1985, last year the figure was 159,000. Fifty percent more washing machines and 300 percent more excavators had to be repaired compared with 3 years ago.

These figures are so alarming that they cannot be overlooked. They must be analyzed and the reasons for negligent and irresponsible work must be revealed.

People are conscientious about work when they constantly improve their skills and value their collectives, workplaces, and honor. But can all people take a firm pride in their job and increase their skills if in every city there are far more jobs than are necessary? No, not all. So what happens is that foremen ask workers to improve their attitude to the job, and the workers reply that they are resigning and going to the neighboring plant, which also has plenty of vacancies. The conclusion is that job certification and rationalization should be conducted more rapidly, obsolete sectors should be eliminated, and each rayon should strive to balance jobs and labor resources. If every job suits the people doing it, work will be creative, meaningful, and productive. That is one of the aims of production restructuring.

A great deal depends on the level of work organization, labor discipline, and responsibility for the job on the part of workers, specialists, and leaders. This idea can be confirmed in the following example. The "Lenvest" footwear joint venture with the FRG recently started operating alongside the well-known "Skorokhod" Footwear Association in Leningrad. Whereas last year the "Skorokhod" Association paid out many millions of rubles in fines for the poor quality of its products and its failure to observe product ranges, "Lenvest" has no worries on this score. Simply because people have a notably different level of responsibility for their job. At "Skorokhod" certain footwear workers, carrying out operations as they pleased, believed that this would be the case at "Lenvest," too—nothing could be further from the truth. If people work poorly then they earn less. Excellent work means high wages. And there are no preset tariffs, rates, or grades. No allowance is made for those who violate discipline. Whereas at "Skorokhod" last year losses of worktime, absenteeism, and equipment breakdowns resulted in production of around 100,000 pairs of shoes being lost, and over 100 pilferers were detained at exit gates, as were many people in a state of inebriation.

Take the situation concerning production organization at the capital's "Dinamo" Association. There is no shortage of specialists and workers in its plant shops. The working rhythm at the association is disrupted month in month out. "What kind of restructuring are we talking about," shop workers say, "if materials are usually only supplied at the end of the month?" It is no accident that

certain shops fulfill 75 percent of the monthly plan in the last week. Need it be said that this "practice" of work and production organization puts people on edge?

Who is to blame? Bureaucrats from the ministries and departments? It is not just their fault. In examining cases of disruption to work rhythm, shoddy work, and shirking, we find, unfortunately, that labor collectives themselves display soft-heartedness, excessive license, and false liberalism. If we have decided to rectify matters in production and restructure ourselves in deeds rather than in words, we must above all instill order at our own enterprises. And not wait for the next appeal from the party committee or the next order from the leadership.

Leaders bear a special responsibility for this work. Particularly now, in the period of the radical economic reform. Poor, incompetent specialists and dilettante chiefs in leadership jobs can cause an enterprise more losses than a whole team or even shop. Whereas real professional leaders draw the correct conclusions from their mistakes and listen to people's opinions, dilettantes at work as a rule are intolerant of criticism from below and become more aggressive and stubborn in carrying out wrong decisions. This is to compensate for their incompetence. Restructuring demands that we immediately rid ourselves of those people who are holding up renewal.

The ability to work doggedly and skillfully is not something people are born with. It is acquired in the process of study and work. In the decades before restructuring we devoted little attention to enhancing the prestige of honest work or improving young people's vocational education. As a rule the least able young people were sent to vocational and technical colleges. They were told: "You're not a good student, your place is in a vocational and technical college." But under present-day conditions workers' jobs require not just high wages but high skills, deep knowledge, and the ability to control the most modern equipment. This means that the working class desperately needs to replenish its ranks with talented young people. New technical colleges are needed based on the 10-grade education system, which will produce highly skilled workers rather than office staff. In short, for restructuring to be implemented it must first of all arrive in the classroom.

Many expert workers have devoted their entire lives to their beloved collective work alongside young people at our enterprises, construction sites, farms, and livestock units. Klavdiya Dmitriyevna Verteshina has been working at the "Dinamo" Association since the start of the Great Patriotic War. Long past retirement age, she continues to carefully and stringently test electric machines. And at the same time, she passes on to the young people her love and responsible attitude toward the job. Production relies on people such as Verteshina and her innumerable students. Jobs are done by skillful and diligent working people!

Consumers Cooperative Congress Analyzed

18280103 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 30 Mar 89 p 3

[Article by A. Kostyukov: "What' is in Your Name?"]

[Text] The old-timers in the Tsentrosoyuz [Central Union of Consumer Societies] say that there has not been such a "militant" congress for a long time. All the speakers as one man began the "criticism" right from the second paragraph without any "allow me to report" or "permit me to assure you." The speaker who is chairman of the Tsentrosoyuz board, P. S. Fedirko, did not press on to any "great achievements" or "large successes" either. The figures for growth and overfulfillment which were previously given in the style of military operations summaries now sounded dry, like hard mathematical facts.

In the spirit of the congress I, too, decided not to drag things out and to say right in the second paragraph that in my opinion and in the opinion of participants in the congress with whom I had occasion to speak during the days of its work, the discussion could have been more businesslike and constructive. This does not contradict what was said above. It is one thing what and how people speak and it is another what and how they decided. If the congress met to sum up the results and to earmark goals, it did this as well as any of the preceding forums. But for a "restructuring congress," as it was called by one of the speakers, this task is apparently a little too simple. Since the time when we began to call things by their real names so many new questions have arisen that there is simply no time for the old ones.

It was revealed, for instance, that our consumers' cooperation, which is among the most widespread—60 million share-holding members—consumer organizations, is such only "for the record." In essence it is a regular state department with all the same old tricks: apportionment from above to below of "control figures," funds, limits, normatives, directive price setting and disposal of profit, the wage rate system to pay for labor—that is, everything that in and of itself presupposes the predominance of administrative authority over regulation democracy. As soon as it became clear that this is not cooperation, experts on the good old "rampant consumerism" started saying that we should—no, we simply must—return its primacy to it and bring the name and the essence into line with one another. This idea was gradually introduced into the texts of the official speeches of the Tsentrosoyuz leaders and by the time of the congress it was a common motif. And this being the case, the delegates by the logic of things would have to discuss and adopt a program for restoration of cooperation. Even if these were not blueprints but for the time being a general plan, an overall concept—this would be enough. The details could be worked out and passed along to the local areas.

Unfortunately, the 3-day discussion, spirited as it was and with all the importance of the needs it revealed, did not culminate with such a program decision. Almost all of those who spoke, beginning with the person giving the report, continued to speak about some "purported cooperation." Perhaps the only thing new was that the delegates came out so sharply and with so much substantiation in favor of liberating consumers' cooperation from the dictatorship of the state agencies. It was indeed painful, it was indeed unacceptable, that the activity of an organization that is public by virtue of its status is regulated not only by the Gosplan [State Planning Committee], but since year before last, by the USSR Ministry of Trade as well, from whose hands the consumers' unions now receive both goods and technological equipment. The cooperators are right to complain about the policy of taxation and state insurance. By what law do the banks grab on to the foreign currency they earn? Can cooperative property really belong to anyone other than the cooperative organization? The Constitution and the Law on Cooperation prohibit this. But life, but practice.... The secretary of the raykom [rayon party committee] takes a consumers' union enterprise and turns it over to the Rayon Agro-industrial Association, the employ of the Ministry of Finance takes cooperative dollars and invests them where it finds necessary. With this kind of apportionment can consumers' cooperation become an independently managing organization, controlled by a single boss—its share holders? A childish question. Such a thing can never be.

A foreign guest spoke at the conference—the president of the International Cooperative Alliance, Lars Markus. He uttered, incidentally, a simple phrase that sounded like a revelation: "The point of the cooperative is to serve its members." Cooperation, having become a state department, has gradually forgotten about that. It has found "more important" tasks than concern for its founders. For example, the purchase of agricultural products for the state supply and processing foodstuffs and selling them in the cities. The delegate from Primorye added also "the assimilation of the natural resources of the taiga."

Cooperation is free to engage in anything it finds necessary that is useful to the society. But it must determine its own tasks and priorities. In the interests of its members. Otherwise, this is what happens. From 1983 through 1988 the retail commodity turnover of Tsentrosoyuz increased by 26 percent or by 12.5 million rubles. The growth was mainly—11 million rubles' worth—from food products, and trade in agricultural products in the cities grew most appreciably—by a factor of 2.4—during these years. How does one evaluate this "growth dynamic"?

If one forgets by whom and for what needs the consumers' cooperation was created, one can only heartily praise it for its activity in solving the food problem. Our tables are still not collapsing under the load. But let us jot down on a sheet of paper a couple more figures. Per capita consumers' cooperation sells less by a factor 1.9 than state trade does. While serving 40 percent of the country's population, it receives from centralized resources only 27-28 percent of the sewn and knitted items and footwear,and less than one-third of the market supplies of television sets, watches, and furniture. And what new acquisitions are turned over to them by distributors from the Ministry of Trade? It turns out that 65 percent of all that is left over in the country, that is, goods for which there is no market, have been left at consumers' union bases. To put it more succinctly, consumers' cooperation does a much worse job of providing footwear and clothing for its shareholders—milkmaids, tractor drivers, calf herders, and agronomists—than state trade does for its consumers—the city dwellers. Almost everyone who spoke at the congress went up to the podium with a list of things that are lacking in the stores. There are no sewing machines, no washing machines, neither adults' nor children's footwear; the situation with clothing is strained; soap is missing....

Now let us imagine that consumers' cooperation actually did belong to its 60 million shareholders and they were aware of the figures given above. Would they be praising the Tsentrosoyuz for the energetic growth of trade in the cities (including trade in industrial goods)? And on what would they recommend spending the cooperative accumulations—building immense gourmet stores and luxurious restaurants in the oblast centers, or the construction of shoe and soap and knitwear factories? In the materials of the congress approval is given to the initiative of the Volgograd oblast consumers' union which has more than 350 of its stores in the cities. But the delegate from Altay Kray who is in charge of a rural store, N. G. Starikova, as I recall, said in a somewhat despairing tone, that in their rural cooperative the last store was built before the revolution. Can one say that this kind of cooperation is working in the interests of its members?

Let us admit it: With its prices, share contributions, and transportation expenses, not only is it not giving its members any benefits or privileges but also, on the contrary, it has become an instrument of discrimination. According to the calculations of the chairman of the board of Rospotrebsoyuz [RSFSR Consumer Cooperative Union], V. F. Yermakov, the Russian rural areas alone annually pay a billion rubles too much for the goods they receive. And the fact that the consumers' unions use the money that is paid from the peasant's pocket for the good of the city dwellers can be explained by only one thing: the undemanding rural shareholder that he is the master of consumers' cooperation.

In order for him to be able to sit in the manager's chair again, undoubtedly, cooperation will have to be wrenched out of the grip of state executive agencies. In this it seems that all the speakers were absolutely right. But this alone is not enough. The grip in which its own management agencies hold it is by no means weaker. But how to release it from this dictatorship—concerning this the delegates, alas, were not given a clear plan. No, there

was a lot of just criticism of the apparatus and correct declarations regarding democratization, but hardly anyone understood what actually should be done in order to return the "state-invaded" and "bureaucratized" consumers' cooperation to normal.

During the course of the precongress debates radical specialists said something to the effect that with the Law on Cooperation and foreign and partially forgotten domestic experience, there is no need to reinvent the wheel. Everyone has known for a long time how cooperative property differs from state property, how the cooperative differs from the state enterprise, and how the cooperative management mechanism differs from that of the state. So let us activate that mechanism in our enterprises and consumers' societies and solve all problems of democratization of management for ourselves. According to this logic it followed that in cooperation there should be nothing but cooperatives—with various profiles and at various levels.

This idea received no support from the consumers' union leadership. If it were acted on all the administrative "vertical" which has been cemented together over the years would go to rack and ruin. The consumers' societies and enterprises would receive the kind of independence that would make people steer clear of taking charge of the offices. And the Tsentrosoyuz would start looking for less dangerous paths, striving to retain cooperation without cooperatives. There would be hybrid variants of enterprises and decorative self-management agencies. But that was before the congress. What did the congress say?

In a 1 and ½ hour-speech P.S. Fedirko devoted exactly 1 and ½ minutes to questions of improving the management mechanism. This was probably not enough time to say anything worth remembering. Therefore the mechanism proposed for the future had to be patched together from fragments of the speeches of other speakers. This is what was patched together: Integration of procurement, processing, and sale according to the type of agricultural combine with which we are familiar, assimilation of economic accountability following the models of the state sector, and also rental and shareholding activity. There is no doubt that this is better than what we had, but it is still not cooperation.

The speaker said literally two words, in passing, about the cooperatives that had penetrated into the bosom of Tsentrosoyuz. True, many of the speakers added to this. These additions, however, were such that at first I did not believe my ears: the workers in consumers' cooperation abused the "kooperativshiks" as they had rarely been abused before. The chairman of the board of the Balva Raypo from Latvia, M.P. Bite, even criticized the Supreme Soviet: They used poor judgment when the adopted the Law on Cooperation. There you have it! We ourselves do not want to live and work according to this law, and we shall not give to others—this is the upshot. Where did this hostility toward "brothers in class" come from? It turns out that the free, nonunion cooperators contrive to get a bag of apples from their country cousin before the procurement worker from the rayon consumers' union appears. In a word, competitors.

Science was also criticized at the congress. It has become a sign of good form among us to castigate science. In this case there was no difficulty since not a single scientist either from among us or from the Academy of Sciences heard the congress. This means that nothing could be said to our friends the scientists. And do not hold the Tsentrosoyuz staff accountable for the lack of a scientific concept for the development of the system—our eternally backward science did not generate one!

This, fortunately, is also a wrongful accusation. There are scientists working competently in the area of cooperation. And they have concepts and it is not difficult to find them in newspaper and magazine articles and in memos addressed to the leadership of Tsentrosoyuz. Without being so bold as to assign evaluations to the developments of scientists, I shall note only one surprising detail: The same free cooperators are happy to take advantage of their services. They are glad to hire them as consultants and even elect them as leaders of their councils and associations. In other words, they are taking not only the apples but also the ideas out from under the nose of consumers' cooperation. And it is true that there is no love lost!

Actually where is science to blame except for that it cannot model cooperation without cooperatives or provide a plan for restructuring the system that does not affect the foundations. After this one automatically doubts that Tsentrosoyuz actually wants to "restore cooperation to a truly democratic basis" or however it is said now. Of the speakers at the congress, incidentally, this doubt was shared by the aforementioned rural store manager from Altay, N.G. Starikova. Of course it is easy for Nina Grigoryevna; she is not burdened with a high position. But what would it be like if the other delegates were to decide to display such candor! Let us take a look at the congress mandate commission: Two-thirds of the delegate mandates are for staff workers of consumers' unions and consumers' societies and only one-third for the cooperative community of many millions. (Among USSR people's deputies from consumers' cooperation elected by the congress the proportion of rank-and-file shareholders decreased to one-fourth).

Stop and think: Why should this audience passionately desire changes which promise no advantage to the majority of those in attendance? Would it be intelligent or moral in principle to demand of people that they themselves saw the legs off their own chairs, and with enthusiasm to boot? It seems to me that this is neither wise nor moral. The question of radical restructuring of consumers' cooperation should be resolved by a forum with a different composition. One in which both in the

hall and in the presidium the majority of seats are held by the legitimate commanders of cooperation—the rank-and-file members, the shareholders themselves.

'Strong Center, Strong Republics' Concept Viewed

18200279 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Mar 89 First Edition p 2

[Article by Yu. D. Maslyukov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the USSR Gosplan: "Strong Center—Strong Republics"]

[Text] All union republics have scored major economic and social achievements developing in the environment of a single national economic complex. At the same time, administrative command methods prevailed in managing the development of the republics. Many functions were concentrated in the center; the economic base and the rights of union republics narrowed abruptly; the fiats of union ministries dominated. All of this reduced the interest of the republics and regions in the final results of economic operations of enterprises situated in their jurisdiction, reduced the opportunity and responsibility for the comprehensive development of territories, and became one of the reasons for complications in interregional and ethnic relations.

Based on the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and resolutions of the 19th All-Union Party Conference, democratization of the entire system of managing the national economy is carried out with a view to eliminating deformations in territorial management; the sphere of economic autonomy and responsibilities of the republics is being substantially expanded in order to bring about an organic combination of all-union and regional interests.

This is the aim of the draft of General Principles for reconstructing the management of the economy and the social sphere in the union republics on the basis of expanding their sovereign rights, self-management, and self-financing which was published in the press. This determines the content of the next, fundamentally significant stage of the economic reform. The draft provides for increasing the role of the center and every union republic in the socioeconomic development of the country on the basis of a division of their responsibilities and a transition by the union republics to the principles of self-management and self-financing.

These tasks are going to be handled in their integral linkage with the political reform under way. New conditions for economic operations in the union republics are the economic basis for the genuine full power of the Soviets of People's Deputies as the main echelon of self-management of the people, the real master of the territory. In turn, the full power of the soviets is a reliable safeguard for a comprehensive solution to all problems of the socioeconomic development of the region which arise.

The implementation of the General Principles creates necessary economic and political prerequisites for solving the acute problems of harmonizing ethnic relations, and reinforcing the Soviet Union as a federated state on this basis.

I must note the truly democratic nature of preparing the document submitted for discussion to the entire people. Gosplan [State Planning Committee] chairmen of all union republics, leading functionaries of the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Gosplan, the USSR Ministry of Finance, the State Committee for Statistics, the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions, and leading scientists of the country in the sphere of economics and law have directly taken part in developing it, and have all made their weighty contribution. The document was reviewed by collectives of some enterprises, the Economic Council, and a joint meeting of the Divisions of Economics and of Philosophy and Law of the USSR Academy of Sciences. The principles of reconstructing the management in union republics were discussed creatively and vigorously in the USSR Council of Ministers with the participation of the chairmen of the Councils of Ministers of all union republics. Therefore, the draft of the General Principles is truly a fruit of profound discussions, but [those held] in the course of friendly joint work by all interested parties.

Main planks of the document were approved by the leadership of all union republics. At the same time, other considerations were voiced concerning its individual planks. I will comment on the most essential considerations because an absolute majority of them refer to planks which were closely analyzed by the compilers of the General Principles but were not included in the document in question. In doing so, I will also submit for discussion the arguments from which the preparers of the document proceeded in developing it.

The 19th CPSU All-Union Conference resolutely stressed the need to develop the independence of the union republics and autonomies, which is inseparably linked to increasing their responsibility for the strengthening and progress of our multinational state.

We need to implement a set of measures allowing us to use the regional factors of economic growth, primarily the production, scientific-technical, and intellectual potential of a territory, more completely, to use natural resources carefully, to enhance the division of labor between republics, and develop the all-union market for the efficient development of every union republic and the entire complex of the national economy. Naturally, the continuous growth of the welfare of the people and ensuring a new quality of their life is the ultimate goal of these processes.

It is expected that the powers of the center and the field in management will be strictly delineated in order to manage the national wealth efficiently. We will need to develop and give a new content to the principle of

democratic centralism under modern conditions. It is obvious that an expansion of rights of union republics and autonomous entities is only possible on the basis of all-people's ownership of the means of production, its unity and unseverability. At the same time, it is planned to substantially enhance the rights of republics in independent disposition of the all-people's assets in their territory.

Strong republics definitely make our union stronger. However, the reverse dependency is also beyond a doubt: Only given a powerful center and efficient solving of problems common for all republics is their own successful development possible. This is why the rapid and efficient development of every union republic and the simultaneous reinforcement of the unified national economic complex as the material basis for the unity of the peoples of the USSR is the main political criterion for delineating the powers and spheres of management of the republics and the center. This is only possible on the basis of establishing a clear dependence of the welfare level of the populace and the resources for the growth of the economy of union republics on the ultimate results of their economic operations and their contribution to the overall development of the country.

In preparing the document, most of the attention was focused on three groups of fundamental issues.

The first group is associated with expanding the powers of the union republics, delineating the spheres and functions of economic management of the union republics and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. The center should manage the production complexes and branches which are pivotal to the operation of the economy of the country as a single entity. These primarily are the basic branches and machinebuilding, the defense industry, all-union transportation, and communications systems, data processing. Certain enterprises of the above complexes and branches serving mainly the needs of a region may be transferred to republic jurisdiction.

The draft document proposes to concentrate under the union republics and local soviets the management of all branches of the social sphere, including production of consumer goods, construction, environmental protection activities, and regional infrastructure.

As is known, foodstuffs, housing, goods and services are the most urgent needs at present. It is quite instructive that the party began the conduct of a new regional policy with transformations in the agroindustrial complex. The plenum of the CPSU Central Committee held in recent days outlined measures aimed at radical political, economic, social, and cultural changes in the life of rural areas. Conditions are being created for the rebirth of various forms of peasant enterprises as complete masters on the land, for the efficient utilization of the potential created in the agrarian sector, for a reliable solution to the foodstuffs issue. The rights and the responsibility of the union republics and local soviets for the rational distribution and regulation of agricultural output through economic methods, for a balanced development of its production, transportation, storage, and processing, for the supply of foodstuffs to the population of their regions are being expanded substantially.

The transfer to union republics of the construction materials industry (except that of union-wide significance), as well as a substantial segment of the timber, wood processing, and pulp-and-paper industries, along with construction, will definitely give the territories a greater opportunity to solve the housing problem.

It was also suggested to transfer to republic control all enterprises reporting to union ministries specializing in the production of consumer goods. However, this could mean the loss of the already formed economic links and deliveries of subcontracted products in line with the state orders for enterprises producing technically complex manufactured goods, which practice extensive production sharing within their branch and have a well-developed servicing network. This is why it is envisaged in the General Principles that, by a decision of the permanent agencies of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, such enterprises may be transferred to republics at their request only if there are conditions ensuring their normal operation.

A small segment of enterprises of the social sphere and other industries transferred to the republics, which, as a rule, have economy-wide significance or are necessary for discharging scientific-technical and organizational-methodological functions common for all republics, may continue to report to the union. For example, some republics suggested that all resort and treatment facilities situated in their territory be transferred to their jurisdiction. Due to the uneven distribution of resort zones in the country and the lack of their natural and climatic equivalence, the adoption of this suggestion would have brought about to unequal opportunity to use sanatoria and resorts for citizens of different republics. Treatment and rest at the resorts of the Crimea and Caucasus would have been made difficult for the inhabitants of the Far North, and those in the south would have been made difficult for the inhabitants of the Baltic republics.

On the contrary, other republics suggest to leave the subway under the Ministry of Railroads and continue funding its construction from the union budget. Despite the outlays for building the subway being large, its development cannot be considered separately from other kinds of mass transit. All issues in transportation services to the urban population should be resolved in their entirety and locally.

Real sovereignty of every union republic becomes qualitatively new and substantially greater as a result of the proposed expansion of the sphere of economic management of union republics. Since a vigorous discussion has recently developed around the problem of sovereignty I

consider it necessary to make a more detailed statement on it. For example, some regional documents include a definition of republic sovereignty as an opportunity to solve independently all issues of political, economic, social, and cultural life, affirm the right of the native ethnic group to self-determination, and preserve the distinctive character of the people. The thesis is being advanced about restoring Lenin's interpretation of the Soviet federation. Meanwhile, in the Treaty on Forming the USSR, prepared under the guidance of V. I. Lenin and adopted by the 1st Congress of Soviets of the USSR on 30 December 1922, solving an entire array of the most significant issues was placed in the jurisdiction of the union state. This included the entire spectrum of international relations, establishing the foundations and general plan of the entire economy of the union, management of transportation, communications, and telegraph, adoption of a unified state budget, adoption of a unified monetary and credit system, main labor laws, and so forth.

Comrades are expressing their bewilderment at the fact that the land on which people of a particular ethnic background have been living for a long time, the mineral wealth, waters, and forests, natural resources for which fees are charged are not the state property of the sovereign republic. However, upon joining the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics the republics pool their property, including land, mineral wealth, waters, and forests as joint assets of the entire people. At the same time, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics determines the jurisdiction of the center in managing and using these common assets. This is also set forth in the Treaty on Forming the USSR of 1922, which placed in the jurisdiction of the union "the establishment of common principles for land distribution and land use, as well as the use of mineral wealth, forests and waters all over the territory of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

Meanwhile, at times the above functions begin to be considered an exclusive right of the republic. However, if a republic makes an independent decision to drain a swamp, build a dam, or conduct wood felling on its territory, then its exclusive right will end up for its neighbors in rivers getting shallow and harvests getting lost. As is known, natural processes do not take into account the boundaries established by man. The all-people's ownership of the mineral wealth, the resources of coal, oil, gas, ores, and other fossil resources are a prerequisite for the development of production forming the basis of a unified national economic complex.

The General Principles provide for endowing union republics with extensive rights to manage assets and natural resources. The priority of territorial management in the issues of environmental protection and use of nature is established. In their territory, union republics will manage the unified state fund of natural resources, adopt, in coordination with the USSR Goskompriroda [state committee for protecting natural resources and the environment] ceilings and standards for the use of natural resources, indicators of efficiency and comprehensive use of natural resources, and grant permits for their development, as well as establish differentiated fees for them. Are these not the functions of a genuine master?

While acknowledging that the document in question is a step forward in expanding the rights and increasing the powers of union republics in the sphere of management, financing, and comprehensive development of the social sphere, some comrades in the field nonetheless argue that the General Principles do not yet guarantee the complete economic independence of the republics. To be sure, sober voices are heard stating that individual republics almost do not have their own natural resources needed for industrializing the national economy, that all that is lacking is being brought in to such regions from other republics. Undoubtedly, this is the essence of the unified national economic complex, the fraternal mutual aid of our people. At the same time, however, this testifies to the incomplete economic independence of the republic, its dependence on other republics, and its inability to solve its problems without their participation.

In conjunction with the transfer of a large number of enterprises to the jurisdiction of republics we will naturally need to specify the functions of corresponding union ministries, and reorganize them if necessary, endow union republics with additional powers in organizing the management of their expanded economy. As is known, the March (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum acknowledged the feasibility of liquidating the USSR Agroprom and restructuring the agroproms of union republics, reinforcing economic approaches, and economic methods of process regulation in their operations.

The General Principles do not set forth specific forms of management in the center and in the republics. These issues should be resolved within the framework of the political reform under way. In the process, the main point is for the expansion of the economic independence of territories not to bring about infringements of the economic accountability rights of the main production element granted to it by the Laws of the USSR on the State Enterprise and on Cooperation, and the substitution of the fiat of republic and local organs for the fiat of branch ministries.

The second group of issues is associated with the reconstruction of the financial and budgetary system in line with the requirements of self-financing of the union republics. Inasmuch as thus far the drawing of the budgets of union republics began with determining and coordinating expenditures, and the lacking revenue was provided from the funds of the union budget, the switch to self-financing presupposes that only what has been generated by [the republic] itself can be spent.

Enterprises will continue to contribute a segment of their profits specified in norms to the budget in strict compliance with the Law of the USSR on the State Enterprise.

At the same time, it is envisaged that revenues going to the republic budgets and to the union budget will be strictly delineated, as well as expenditures made in each element of this system.

The entire sum of fees for the land, water, labor resources for all enterprises situated in the territories of union republics is envisaged to be contributed to the revenue side of their budgets, regardless of the affiliation of enterprises. The rates of such fees will be set by the republics themselves on the basis of the economic valuation of the land, water and labor supply in individual regions (rayons). In this manner, they will gain an opportunity to regulate through economic means the siting of enterprises in different areas, use natural and labor resources frugally, and protect the natural environment. It is envisaged that payments by resorts and tourist facilities of union significance for the use of natural resources and common infrastructural facilities will be introduced; they must be contributed to the budget of the union republic in whose territory such facilities are located.

Enterprises reporting to union ministries are obligated to contribute a segment of profit specified in long-term norms to republic and local budgets, and enterprises reporting to republic and local authorities, in their capacity of an element of all-people's property, to the union budget. This approach implements in a more complete manner the all-people's nature of the state property regardless of its branch affiliation, and stresses the need for all enterprises to ensure the reinforcement of the unified economic complex. With a view to increasing the economic interest of republics in the results of operation of enterprises reporting to union ministries, it is envisaged to substantially increase the share of payments by the latter to the revenue side of republic budgets—tentatively up to 40 percent of book (after the payments for resources are subtracted) profit (or income—under the second pattern of economic accountability).

In the course of preparing the General Principles, a vigorous discussion developed on the nature of distributing the turnover tax between the union budget and budgets of union republics. Suggestions were made to direct the turnover tax on goods, in cases where it is largely in the nature of an excise [tax] and is collected on the sales of manufactured goods (jewelry, wine and liquor, tobacco, cotton and wool fabrics, passenger cars, refinery products), to the union budget, and for other goods to the republic budget. In this case, republics selling the final product would stand to win unjustifiably, and those producing raw and other materials, and semifinished products for it would stand to lose.

It would be expedient to direct state taxes on the populace to the revenue of the state budget because all working people are citizens of the USSR. However, all of us are also citizens of the republic in whose territory we live. Therefore, tax revenues should be split in some proportion. However, in this case there is no provision for the outlays of republics on the social needs for satisfying which they are primarily responsible. Therefore, it is envisaged that these taxes will be transferred to the republic budgets in their entirety.

A variant of forming the state budget of the country is advanced which is built on the principle of primary accumulation of all payments by enterprises situated in the territory of union republics in their budgets, with the subsequent transfer of some of their revenue to the union budget. This approach was considered during the development of the General Principles, and was not accepted because it does not conform to the principle of delineating the spheres of economic operations, deprives the union budget of an independent and stable revenue base, and poses the danger of strengthening the economic dictate of republics to all enterprises situated in their territory.

The draft of the General Principles envisages increasing the responsibility of the union republics for balancing the monetary income and expenditures of the populace, strengthening the circulation of currency, and fulfillment of cash intake plans.

In the field of remuneration for labor, some republics suggested that they be given the right to independently set pay rates and pay grades in all sectors of the national economy reporting to them. However, this would make it impossible to carry out a uniform country-wide policy in the sphere of labor and wages. Besides, in this case the dependence of remuneration for labor on final results may be violated: The pay rates and grades cannot be canceled if the financial situation worsens. Therefore, the General Principles provide for the right of republics to introduce bonuses and additions to the salaries of employees in offices financed from the budget of republics. In the production sphere, such bonuses are set by the enterprises independently [and financed] from their own sources.

The third group of problems is associated with improving the forms and methods of planned management of the socioeconomic development of republics. The composition of initial planning data communicated to the republics, measures on the further improvement of the system of material and technical supply, expansion of the rights of republics in capital construction, and in accelerating the scientific-technical progress have been outlined in keeping with the requirements of self-management and self-financing. Much attention has been paid to the issues of increasing the independence of republics in carrying out environmental protection measures, as well is in foreign economic activities.

In the course of developing the General Principles, it was suggested that control statistics be excluded from the set of initial data communicated to the republics, because they supposedly infringe on the independence of republics. However, control statistics are communicated only as reference points necessary for the joint preparation of decisions on the volume of national income, setting the pertinent norms for the contribution from profits (income) to the union and republic budgets, and maintaining the material and financial balance in the economy of the entire country.

Some republics made a suggestion to the effect that union ministries reserve the capacity of enterprises for carrying out republic orders. However, the centralized reservation of enterprise capacities runs counter to the Law on the Enterprise. With a view to improving the utilization of capacity at union enterprises the General Principles provide for union ministries communicating the initial data simultaneously to enterprises and to the Councils of Ministers of union republics. Having pertinent information on the volume of state orders, the republic management agencies will be able to organize the production of goods needed by the republic at the enterprises on a contractual basis.

The issue of expanding the extent of the state order is significant as a matter of principle. The document under consideration rules out the right of union republics to directly set state orders for enterprises reporting to union ministries. I believe that suggestions on introducing the so-called local order to be placed by the soviets of people's deputies at all enterprises, including those reporting to union ministries, should be treated likewise. The above suggestions run completely counter to the Law on the State Enterprise; their acceptance may infringe substantially on the independence of enterprises, and reinforce the dictate of republic and local management agencies.

The restructuring of management of union republics is an integral part of the general concept of restructuring in the economy of our country. Along with redistributing the functions among the union branch and republic management agencies, the issue of their distribution among territorial management agencies of different levels arises. The task is to provide closer coordination of the General Principles submitted for a general discussion with the Law on Local Self-Management and Local Economy keeping in mind the fact that some functions of union republics provided for by the General Principles must be delegated to local soviets. These issues should be considered with particular care where autonomous republics are involved.

Some comrades call for envisaging different variants of self-management and self-financing in some union republics. However, it will be impossible to retain and reinforce the unity of the single national economic complex if this proposal is implemented. After all, the most significant task of centralized management is exactly to ensure the unity of the state-wide mechanism of economic operations.

The work necessary for developing the 5-year plan for 1991-1995 needs to be organized on the basis of the new approaches, envisaged by the General Principles, toward the issues of increasing the economic independence of union republics and their responsibility for the comprehensive planning and development of the national economy, for improving the standard of living of the populace. Methods of interrepublic comparisons in the sphere of production, distribution, and consumption of products, the social sphere, as well as interrepublic deliveries will have to be improved.

The development and precise detailing of the General Principles of Self- Management and Self-Financing of the Republics will be carried out as the price system is improved and the sphere of wholesale trade is expanded, transition is made from the normative principle of distributing profits (income) to tax collection, and the value-added tax is introduced into the economic parctice. The General Principles, which reflect both the essence of radical transformations in democratizing the economic management and social development, and the present status of the economic reform, are open to all subsequent innovations. This is the guarantee of stability of the system proposed.

'Flexible' National-Territorial Structure Urged

PM1004083589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Mar 89 Second Edition p 3

[Viktor Andriyanov article under the rubric "Notes of a Publicist": "Togetherness"]

[Excerpts] I will begin with a letter: "I am 22 years old. I prefer not to give my name. A Khakas [Siberian ethnic group] by nationality, I live in Abakan. I don't even know where to start. It is a matter of interethnic relations, you see. The newspapers write about the friendship of peoples of all nationalities. In the majority of cases this is probably true, I do agree. However, what I see around me reflects something else...."

The young woman then goes on to describe how in preparation for New Year she and her colleagues decorated the store where they work. They drew a Grandfather Frost in the store window.... Suddenly a couple of Russian guys entered the store and said spitefully: "Ah, we have a national crew here, everyone a Khakas. Even Grandfather Frost has a Khakas mug." A scandal ensued.... "I thought it might make me feel better if I wrote about it. But not in the least; I still feel bitter and furious...."

Have you, honestly, never witnessed such an incident? I am convinced that you have. Sometimes, without realizing how it will wound their interlocutors' national

feelings, people refer to the "mug." It may be a Tatar, or Jewish, or Khokhlyat, or Russian, or Asiatic mug.... To attribute such behavior simply to ignorance would be an oversimplification. Nonetheless, it springs from a spiritual emptiness and moral brutishness which sometimes characterize even people with diplomas and degrees. Incidentally, allow me to say in passing that degrees and diplomas are no yardstick of a person's integrity. I do not know what sort of education the wits described in the letter from Abakan had received. It may have been secondary education, or even higher education. The only thing I know is that neither school, nor university, nor family had taught them how to behave. They were let loose without having been taught how to live among people.

In our vast country there is probably not a single corner where people of only one nationality live. The processes of internationalization, which are characteristic of the world as a whole, bring together children of various nations and make them live in one spot. This is a metaphor as well as a fact of daily life. [passage omitted]

As a result of migration millions of people have moved and continue to move to new places. For many of the migrants, quota workers, and other volunteer travelers, the new places are like the Klondike. And that applies not just to far-flung places but also to the most central areas. The would-be settlers arrive, without giving a thought to what obstacles they may encouter, blissfully ignorant of what people and nations have lived there before them and indeed still live there. The thought occurs to me: Would it not be expedient to review the national-territorial structure in the light of current conditions? And make it, in general, more flexible? Let it take into account the interests of those people who live outside national formations or for whom such formations do not exist. It might be useful to teach people the rudiments of ethnography. How about a good book on the subject, or a television program? These should not acquaint people only with regions which enjoy official status. There are 53 national-territorial entities in our country, as against more than 120 different Soviet nations and ethnic groups.

Of late, news has been coming in from various places about the revival of multilingualism. Azeri language courses have been started up at Baku enterprises, and official business is beginning to be conducted in two languages. In five rayons of Donetsk Oblast where there are close-knit Greek communities, broadcasts in modern Greek were started last year. Our oblast radio and television have always broadcast in two languages—Russian and Ukrainian. In Moscow the Mikhoels Jewish Cultural Center has opened. Articles in Uzbek are being published in Tajik rayon newspapers and vice versa.... In a number of republics, legislation on the state language which takes the requirements of other sections of the population into account has been adopted.

Our general interest in ethnic issues has not gone unnoticed abroad. "...Virtually in all union republics, the Voice of America claims, the intelligentsia and activists are sounding the alarm, calling for radical measures to save their languages from extinction.... According to the opinion of many activists, legislation on language alone is not enough to remove the threat of Russification in the national entities. It must be backed up by other measures, such as curbs on the settlement of Russians in the national republics and greater local control over the economy." This kind of program, or—to call a spade a spade—recipe for self-isolation, is being dictated to us by the Voice of America.

I do not know whether this radio station ranks Vasiliy Barladyanu from Odessa among the "activists." According to a different terminology, he passes for a "rights champion." His program is the Ukrainianization of the local population, unconditional elimination of the Russian language both from daily communication and official use, and total autonomy from Moscow. UKRAINSKIY VISNYK, the samizdat journal published by Chernovol and Gorin, acquainted its readership with this program, which was subsequently broadcast by the "Radio Liberty" station.

The title of the "journal" seemed familiar to me; I had seen it somewhere before. Then I remembered that a weekly under this title was published in Berlin. It was the "organ of the Ukrainian national association." It breathed its last with issue No 163, when the rumble of Soviet guns could already be heard in the editorial office. In the period leading up to that time many newspapers and journals in the languages of the peoples of the USSR were published in fascist Germany. It was a question of all kinds of nationalist rags and publications intended for the millions of "Ostarbeiter." Their staffers earned their keep from the fascists according to their abilities. In their private correspondence, preserved in archives, they sometimes allowed themselves to be frank. In one of the archives I came across the following reply to a Ukrainian emigre who had submitted an article about Ukrainian independence: "...since the national issue is now also a political issue, you will be able to understand that it is impossible to publish your letter because of censorship strictures, irrespective of what the editor might wish. I must say that the soul of a sinner on its way to heaven through purgatory is subjected to fewer trials and tribulations than our journal when it is being prepared for printing. It can happen that articles are removed from the pages and replaced by others, less controversial. Between you and me, I can tell you that here, in Germany, there can be no mention of a separate Ukraine...."

In August 1944 the UKRAINSKIY VISNYK unwittingly disclosed the true views of some of its readers. This was provoked by a letter from a lieutenant who had been captured and whose name ended in "-enko." The letter was written in Russian. Its author, a Ukrainian,

wrote about his love for Pushkin and Shevchenko. "Moscow," he claimed, "has become as close to my Ukrainian heart as Kiev, and the Russians are our blood brothers."

"Who is this compatriot of ours?"—VISNYK complained. "His talk is all too familiar; it smacks of Bolshevism. Is Mr Moskal, or even Moskalenko, not actually a Bolshevik posing as a "Russian nationalist"?

A few months later the editorial office returned to this theme with a long article covering almost 1 and ½ pages entitled "Bolshevik Poison from the Bolshevik Chalice. Reflections on the Sentiments of Young Ukrainians Who Have Swallowed the Komsomol Line." There was nothing good about it. It went so far as to refer to the young men being deported for forced labor in Germany as "Bolshevik agents infiltrated behind the lines."

But let us return to the present. Here are letters from our current mailbag. Authors pass on their observations of what is happening in the Baltic republics and the Ukraine. Many are alarmed at the blatant intolerance of some "champions" of their mother tongue and own culture toward anything not their own. Biligualism is no good, they claim. The right to choose one's language serves no purpose. According to them, the time has come to renounce internationalism.... The thrust of the attack is quite obvious: It seeks to disunite rather than unite. The great Soviet poet, the Communist Boris Oleynik, speaking about such attempts, put it very aptly recently: "We will not retreat an inch in our struggle for our language, culture, history, and national character of the Ukraine. But we will rebut with equal resolve anyone, anywhere, who harbors evil intentions with respect to the eternal friendship of our peoples—be they "well-wishers" from abroad or "our own."

Both the foreign "well-wishers" and their yes-men on our own soil are working without respite. They are concocting appeals and charters, prophesying "flareups of nationalism," and even predicting the "disintegration of the Soviet Union."

The last prediction comes from Professor G. Hosking, a British academic. This Russian history specialist rates the level of economic development of the union republics, and Estonia and Georgia in particular, as very high, despite the aforementioned gloomy predictions. He also believes that the "languages and cultures of the main non-Russian peoples have not wilted, and in certain respects have even developed and strengthened as a result of their membership in the USSR."

And we can add, not only the main ones. Vast socioeconomic differences between peoples have been overcome precisely during the years of Soviet power. Friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance among peoples are our great acquisitions. Our solidarity has helped to raise national cadres, given peoples their written language, and helped to protect the country. Solidarity is reviving Armenian cities and villages.

Every nation, great or small, has a right to expect appreciation and attention from its compatriots. I do not intend to add up how much screen or air time or newspaper coverage specific republics get, but perhaps we should add it up, perhaps one channel of Central Television should be given over to national programs which would be presented by the television studios of union and autonomous republics. Traveling around the country, you often see people's feelings being hurt through lack of attention. I was told this in Yakutia too.

Nights in May in Yakutsk are like happiness—bright and short. Not a soul can be glimpsed on the deserted streets; only the traffic lights keep changing. It is nearly midnight and yet the students will not let us go. There is no end to their questions. Leafing through our notes, we have just been answering questions in a crowded university hall for a couple of hours. Yet here they come again: "Why do people in the West of our country know little about our republic? Why does Yakutia not get much coverage in the central newspapers?" "Both my grandfathers perished at the front line. One is still registered as missing. My grandmother is still thinking about them, about the war, and the hard work in the hinterland. She recalls how she ate sand out of hunger on the banks of the Lena. I and my grandmother would very much like to see a television feature or documentary movie about Yakut servicemen fighting in the Great Patriotic War. My grandmother is constantly looking forward to the day when she will see such a movie on the screen...."

This reproach is justified. It could be repeated in Buryatia, Karakalpakia, and many other places, no doubt.

"I have been wanting to write this letter for a long time, but all along I was afraid of something." This is how the letter with which I began ends. Now the fear has disappeared. People are openly writing, thinking, and arguing about the national setup. But let us not forget that our strength lies in togetherness.

Lithuanian 'Freedom League' Member Interviewed

LD0504132889 Vilnius KOMJAUNIMO TIESA in Lithuanian 2 Feb 89 pp 1,2

[Interview with A. Terleckas and other League members by correspondent Aldona Svirbutaviciute, entitled "Thunder in Midwinter" under the rubric "Lithuanian Freedom League: Impressions and Opinions"; date and place not given]

[Excerpts] Currently, we are experiencing more frequent comparisons with events of recent times. We recall, for example, 23 August of the year before last...or 16 February of last year...and, most recently, the stormy summer and fall of 1988—and now it appears we are freeing ourselves from the clutches of an internal censor and no

one will force us to condemn or denounce anybody, for any reason, again. It seems to me that it is possible today to hold dialogues with those who think differently and who hold different positions. Not only is dialogue possible! One can speak in alternative terms—one can differ, deny, and argue, but one must not turn one's own opinion into a dictate for another's thoughts. For this reason, I set out to meet and interview Freedom League member Antanas Terleckas. We were encouraged to write on this subject by readers' letters, which expressed an interest in what the League was about. Here are two such letters espousing two opposing points of view.

Workers of the Institute for Chemistry and Chemical Technology Science of the Academy of Sciences sent an "Appeal," which states:

"It is highly important to open opportunities for the widest possible segments of society to participate in the ongoing active process of social renewal. The Lithuanian Freedom League is also a participant in this process. Unfortunately, the general public has no opportunity to acquaint itself with League activity, goals and program, since the press treats League activities in a biased manner, confining itself to accusations of anti-Soviet behavior, without providing any argumentation. (...)

"On the basis of opinions emanating from the pluralism principle we ask you: 1. To announce the League's program in the press. 2. To hold a Lithuanian Television forum with League representatives. 3. To invite all those who have accused the League of anti-Sovietism to defend their opinion.

We are convinced these steps would allow every citizen to form his own opinion on the Lithuanian Freedom League." [passage omitted]

The other collective letter was written by workers at the Vilnius Enterprise for Radio Measurement Devices. It is entitled "Appeal to the Lithuanian Freedom League." It states:

"League members, are you not yet aware of the fact that in having obtained democratic freedoms, you are attempting, in an uncontrolled surge and through your declared and twisted understanding of freedom, accompanied by shouts of 'Lithuania—without Russians,' to push young people toward extremism? What sort of freedom are you shouting about? Do you not detect in this the fumes of a fascist torch? 'Germany—for the Germans!'

"How do you picture a free Lithuania? Like Israel—only for the Jews? What are your principles? Our entire country is aching because of Stalinist sacrifices. Were only Lithuanians victims of repression? Is there any nation in the Soviet Union which has not suffered from the Stalinist terror?

"Members of the Freedom League! Describe in concrete terms—what kind of free Lithuanian do you envision? Without Russians, Poles, Belorussians, Jews? What sort of nationality will be given mixed families? Perhaps you will select a pure race, as was done in fascist Germany, and will restrict to reservations or deport all those who do not meet the purity standard?

"Since we are now permitted to express our opinions freely, let us speak out in a reasonable manner. We support dialogue. We oppose, however, extremist slogans. We are all for the nation's rebirth, national singularity, and national culture, but not for nationalism. Lithuania—is the common home for all of us. However, it is not permissible to entice youth with antisocialist slogans, hooliganistic attacks, the halting of transport, and the creation of disorder.

"We stand for restructuring, but not for anarchy. We are for the intelligent use of freedom and for those rights which become our life's norm. We stand for unity among nations and respect among ourselves.

"We propose, however, that the Freedom League, because of its nationalistic tendency, be declared to be outside the legal boundary."
(24 signatures)

[Svirbutaviciute] What do we know about the Lithuanian Freedom League? To be frank, nothing, except biased newspaper information, where the League is branded as "a group espousing anti-Soviet orientation, which demands restoration of a Lithuania based on the 1939 political structure," "an anti-Soviet league, which seeks to create conflict between Lithuanian and Soviet Union interests, slanders Communist Party activity and incites national discord," "a league characterized by an anti-Soviet attitude, which seeks achievement of provocational goals and opposes socialism." That is almost all.... [passage omitted]

Antanas Terleckas invites me inside a modestly furnished small room. The bookshelf is crammed with books and magazines. [Passage omitted]

He begins to talk....

[Terleckas] Our League was founded in 1978. It took us a long time to decide on a name for it. We published our program in AUSRA [Dawn], a small newspaper. In 1979 we began to publish VYTIS [national state emblem: Grand Duke Vytautas], where we published a moral memorandum addressed to the USSR Government. Our goal—to seek and demand independence for Lithuania. We hold meetings and demonstrations. Last May, we began our public action; we labeled ourselves as: those who have nothing to lose.

I often declare that nothing has changed for the better in Lithuania. I feel I am not speaking the truth, however. Many changes have taken place, and there exist many

things to thank Gorbachev for. He is a brave man. Whenever I was called in for questioning formerly, I was accused of weakening the Soviet Government. I would anwer briefly: I am waiting for a government which will not be weak and will not fear what we have to say. After all, why should we be feared? The government controls everything—the Army, the procuracy, the security organs, the militia and the mass imformation media. I think we now have that type of government. We discuss everything with confidence. It is far better to discuss than to sharpen one's swords in secret.

[Svirbutaviciute] I was reminded, at this point, of the words of philosopher R. Ozolas (Svyturys No 23, 1988): "An alternative perception should not be a source of trouble for the party, but one of strength. Any type of alternative position is currently labelled as anti-Soviet and anti-party. The sooner we become capable of overcoming this trait, the sooner we will begin to become stronger."

[Terleckas] I remember 1940. I was 12 years old. We greeted the Red Army—without anger, but with good feelings, since we were told at the time that it would not be for long, but temporarily, simply for the duration of the war. We were workers of a country estate; my father was happy to obtain several hectares of land and worked very hard. But afterwards.... Two of my mother's brothers were arrested and deported to camps. One uncle died there, the other returned an invalid and died shortly after. The war somehow bypassed us. I saw the Germans, for the first time, just as the war was ending. After the war, when I was 16, I was arrested and kept in Svencioniai Prison for two months. I don't know why we were arrested; we were told they needed to establish and to verify my age, to make sure I was truthful about my age. I was very afraid there. Fortunately, the Chekha official in charge was a decent individual—I was released. I began to study, after that, and finished a technical trade school. In 1949 I began to study economics at the university.

I even joined the Komsomol, but started to despise this organization later, as I became aware of the deceit and the meanness. An order was issued to expel one student from the Komsomol (apparently, his parents had been deported to Siberia, and he had kept that a secret). Out of 120 Komsomol members, four of us voted against this order, 16 for, and 100 members abstained because they were afraid to raise their hands. Later, I was also expelled from the Komsomol ranks, but did manage to complete my university studies. I worked as a bank inspector and later became deputy chief of Vilnius City State Bank. Following the 20th [party] conference, I became convinced that we had arrived at rebirth—it is possible to criticize and to speak openly. Alas! In 1957, while I was in the midst of graduate study, I was arrested and, in accordance with article 58 of the Criminal Code, sentenced to 4 years at Taishet Camp in Irkutsk Region. For what crime? University Lithuanists had decided to form a "National Front." I was invited to their meeting, where nothing was decided. But this provided sufficient pretext.... After my return, I worked here and there, and in 1964 entered the university to study history—I was completing my studies. However, I was not permitted to defend my thesis.... In 1973, trumped-up charges were brought against me and I spent a year in prison.... As a result of this, it was difficult for me to find work. I worked as a doorman at the Opera and Ballet Theater and as a loader at a movie studio. In 1978 I was tried in accordance with Article 68 of the Criminal Code—sentenced to eight years. Three years were spent in a camp and five in exile. What was my crime? We published VYTYS and circulated "Memorandum 45" concerning the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. In those days, this was called anti-Soviet propaganda and agitation. I spent time in Magadan. Well, such is life. It contains everything—both hot and cold. It is not fitting to complain now, since we are allowed to organize meetings, distribute our newspapers and even appear in public. You asked me how I appraise the Lithuanian Sajudis? They are decent individuals, who act honorably. Much has been accomplished by them. I am not excessively entranced by their activity, because they are making too many compromises. Thus they handed the tricolor over to the Stalinists. That is not to may liking. They lack political maturity....

[Svirbutaviciute] Such was our conversation. Some time later, we met again. This was a public meeting. The "Gaublys" Club had invited League members to their public theater in the Trade Union Building. An open and heated discussion ensued, lasting three hours. After conversing with Antanas Terleckas, I approached Ceslovas Jursenas, Linas Linkevicius and Arvydas Juozaitis to provide their opinions on the Lithuanian Freedom League.

[Jursenas, political reviewer, Lithuanian SSR State Committee For Television and Radio] The concept by the Lithuanian Freedom League of separating Lithuania from the Soviet Union is unacceptable to me. I do not like their categorical stance of placing themselves as the only ones espousing a just cause. They insist: the party is unlawful, Sajudis is unlawful, and neither the Russian intelligentsia nor those abroad understand them. Even the Lithuanian dissidents do not all understand them. In other words, they are the only ones who are right. I wonder if this is so? As became apparent during the meeting at the "Gaublys" Club, League representatives lack the elementary knowhow of associating with those who think differently. After all, we of the "Gaublys" Club invited them here as our guests, while they were inviting us, the hosts, to vacate the premises. During discussions they failed to provide answers to the more pointed, concrete questions. For example, how many members dos the League have? The Lithuanian nation is going along with Sajudis, but who is aligned with the League? Why has Vytautas Bogusis been removed from the League?

[A. Juozaitis, philosopher, Seimas member of Lithuanian Sajudis] The existence of the Lithuanian Freedom

League is a normal phenomenon in a democratic society. This can be deduced from their program's basic political assertion—public statements are weapons in political confrontation. This is a fundamental condition for existing in a democratic society, without threatening and destroying its foundations. Until recently, the League has been attacked in drastic and biased terms. This indicates democratic deficiency. One must be aware that League leaders are not simply individuals expounding their ideas for nothing, since they are prepared, at any moment, to suffer repressions for them. This is one of the most essential characteristics of humanness. In that sense, they may be regarded as idealists. It must not be forgotten, however, that ideas give birth to great social changes.

[L. Linkevicius, section chief, Central Committee, Lithuanian Komsomol] I do not regard the Lithuanian Freedom League as a force enjoying much support. It is, rather, a plurality of opinions in action. We have become too accustomed to a type of society in which everything was required to be approved. Concurrently we were exhibiting a sickly reaction toward those whose opinions differed. The League slogans are not realistic, even if they appeal to certain people; as they mention independence, for instance. We see it differently. We stand for a sovereign socialist republic which makes independent decisions on economics, culture, and social questions. I think the League has different goals. It does not have definite proposals on how these can be achieved.

Hunger Strike Fuels Estonian Ethnic Strife

18000747 Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Mar 89 p 2

[Article by L. Vajno, PRAVDA correspondent: "In the Heat of Mutual Resentment"]

[Text] Tamara Nikolayevna Buslovich remained on a hunger strike against administrative arbitrariness for 10 days; she spent these nights and days in a red Zhiguli [car] in downtown Tallinn surrounded all the time by a hostile crowd.

I will say right away that thus far I have no reason to take her side without reservations (and approve her method of struggle) in the work-related conflict which became the reason for the hunger strike, though it is customary to the point of being trivial—an employee whose high qualifications are beyond a doubt (as well as, incidentally, her "inconvenient" character) was let go in conjunction with staff reductions. Tamara Nikolayevna considers the administration of the Estsurgutdorstroy Trust incompetent, and demands not only that she be reinstated on the job, but also that new management be elected, and the trade union committee be elected before the end of the [current] term. She has exacted compliance with one of her demands—an objective commission has been appointed in order to conduct an anonymous survey of the labor collective. If the results turn out to be unfavorable for the management, elections of management are likely to be scheduled. We will definitely follow the course of events. However, it was not only this conflict in itself that prompted me to reach for my pen.

...I spent half an hour sitting next to Tamara Nikolayevna in the car. You would not wish this upon your enemy. They shook the car, hurled insults, and dropped small change, potatoes, slices of bread on the roof and hood. According to what Tamara Nikolayevna said, at night it is particularly scary: they jump on the roof, screw off the lid of the gas tank, and threaten to set the car on fire—all of this because Tamara Nikolayevna decided, when she began her strike, to attract the attention of participants in one of the meetings which are now so frequent in Tallinn. On that day, 14 March, the meeting was called on the initiative of the Intermovement at the city hall. Later she would say: "It was not important for me which political movement convened the meeting. I just wanted to attract the attention of the public and the press. Had there been a meeting of the People's Front on this day I would have gone there as well." There is a reason for saying that our hindsight is always 20/20. Activists of the People's Front took her hunger strike as [an expression of] support for the Intermovement. Soon they began calling her a stool-pigeon. Tamara Nikolayevna got involved in a conflict situation which was vigorously exploited by intrigued politicians.

A question torments her: Why are the hard-working people, who are the same as her, her class brothers, so vicious? After all, many of them may become victims of administrative arbitrariness themselves any day. A curious detail: a group of Finnish tourists put a bouquet of flowers on the hood, and slipped a 10-ruble note under the windshield wiper (the Tallinn tour is not expensive, and there are many workers among the tourists). They did no particular investigation: Since a person is protesting a firing, they should show class solidarity. However, her fellow Estlanders (a currently fashionable word denoting that both Estonians and non-Estonians belong on the same Estonian land) are busy doing something else. They are counting and piling up their mutual grudges. Political passions with a generous admixture of national motives obstruct the main goals of restructuring. The bureaucrat with a long tenure whose armchair began to shake at one point is now rubbing his hands with joy: for as long as the masses are incapable of supporting the toiler who is standing up for his rights the bureaucrat may be confident....

Our readers may remember from our publications that the beginning of the pick-up in the political activity of the masses associated with restructuring was promising. A broad independent movement which soon constituted itself as the People's Front arose on the wave of the ecological threat and protest against the arbitrariness of ministries. The Estonian Communist Party Central

Committee managed to overcome the inertia of stagnation, and took a step to meet this movement. A 100,000-strong meeting admonished the delegation of Estonian Communists going to the 19th all-union party conference.

This was the beginning.... However, a distortion soon set in. The People's Front did not manage to attract to its ranks any meaningful segment of the Russian population. Endeavors benefitting all citizens of Estonia (regional economic accountability, sovereignty of the republic within the USSR, implementation of the power of the soviets, and so forth) were by and large transplanted to the utterly national grounds, and preference for representatives of the native nationality was emphasized. It is true that Estonians have no other motherland, and they are to struggle for their civil and national rights in this very location, on these 45,000 square kilometers of land. But it is also beyond a doubt that as an individual an Estonian should have no advantages over citizens of other nationalities.

Unfortunately, this elementary truth of general human morality was entirely forgotten in many cases. How else can we explain the cartoons and newspaper retorts which insult the national dignity of people, or the attempts to pass laws which wittingly infringe on the rights of representatives of the non-native population? How can the constantly aired demand be explained to restrict the provision of republic citizenship in the future law by a formidable length-of-residence requirement? Was it necessary to force through the Law on the Language, was it truly needed for the defense of the Estonian language, if unrealistic deadlines for its implementation have been set, and, in addition, it has not been "translated" into the language of economics, as funds, instructors, and study aids are lacking...?

All of this, combined with the tireless activities of extremists of a nationalist stripe, could not but cause natural alarm among the non-Estonian population. Alternative movements began to spring up—the Intermovement in which mainly the toilers of non-Estonian nationalities participate, and the United Council of Labor Collectives in which managers of large enterprises reporting to union ministries dominate. There are again useful ideas and proposals in the area of restructuring the economy, social defense, and political reform. Many points of the main movements coincide; on others, there are differences; and the third group are the exact opposites. It would seem that the commonality will provide prerequisites for a constructive debate, broad discussion, and subsequently consolidation; after all, the interests of all those living in the republic are common, and they are within the current of restructuring. The Estonian Communist Party Central Committee is calling for consolidation, but there is still no constructive talk. Instead of it, there are new flashes of confrontation.

On his authority, the director of a large plant reporting to a union [ministry] suspends at his enterprise the Law on the Language adopted by the Supreme Soviet of the Estonian SSR. A group of social activists addresses an open letter to the prosecutor of the republic called upon to safeguard the law, and qualifies this action as contravening the law. In his turn, the director refers to a precedent: Did not the Supreme Soviet of the republic adopt at its session on 16 November a similar decision on all-union laws? They object: The administrative power is not the supreme power. And so on, and so forth. Mutual grudges continue to pile up, to be fueled, and at times exaggerated.

I saw the tears of joy in the eyes of many Estonians when on Independence Day, 24 February, the national tricolored flag rose above the Big Hermann Tower in Tallinn. Many Russians, Ukrainians, Belorussians, Azerbajanis, Lithuanians shared their feeling. Perhaps it is immoral nowadays to argue against the rebirth of national symbols. However, why wasn't this event preceded by a broad democratic discussion of the ceremony itself, which would have helped to avoid the resentment and awkwardness associated with the lowering of the state flag of the Estonian SSR on the same tower? Why did one of the leaders of the People's Front, E. Savisaar, allow himself a disrespectful statement about the red flag with a blue wave, which remains the state flag of the republic and still flies over the buildings of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the Estonian SSR? First Secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee V. Valjas gave a principled evaluation of this statement by the CPSU member E. Savisaar. It was harshly criticized by many speakers at a meeting convened by the Intermovement.

All of this was fair. However, they began to go overboard again—this time, members of the Intermovement. It came to the point when the republic prosecutor had to resolutely intervene in the heated passions, and call some irresponsible people to order. As far as a constructive dialogue and subsequent consolidation are concerned, they are again delayed for an indefinite period of time....

Judging from the composition of delegates to constituent assemblies, clerical employees account for the core of all movements. Nonetheless, I am far from the idea of accusing them of conscious pandering to the bureaucracy resisting restructuring. However, we must admit that an escalation of mutual grudges objectively plays into the hands of those who do not agree with the changes. The humane content of restructuring, its orientation toward defending the interests and rights of an individual taken separately, remain merely a theoretical consideration in Estonia. Meanwhile, this very aspect could become the common one for all nationalities and movements, the basis of consolidation.

Tamara Nikolayevna "wronged" the native population by coming to an Intermovement meeting—without any ulterior motive, as it were. Activists of the People's Front did not see fit to calm down the irritated inhabitants of Tallinn by at least just explaining the true objective of her strike. The Intermovement could have given her

protection; they say it even offered to post a picket. However, Tamara Nikolayevna does not at all want to become the focus of a new interethnic conflict. She believes that she has gone to battle with a quite specific "international" bureaucracy on behalf of the rights and dignity of the working person. This goal commands respect, unacceptable as the method of a hunger strike is; however, the movements hear the voice of a person only until the national-political tint is present in it. Passions are boiling over. In this tangle of passions fanned from both sides, behind the fence of mutual rebukes, it is easy not only to lose the global, the very content of restructuring, but also the "private," the man with his resentment, his concern, and his pain. This is what seemed to me to be the most important in this unusual story.

Belorussian First Secretary Addresses Afghan Vets
18000731a Minsk SOVETSKAYA BELORUSSIYA in Russian 5 Feb 89 p 1

[BELTA release: "In a Frank and Businesslike Manner"]

[Text] For each of them the return home was much more than merely knocking on the front door. The road home was the path to oneself and a search for one's place in life. This does not always come easily. Those who have crossed it in various years know this. But the fellows burned by the Afghan sun and the powder burns of hard fighting do not have to be acquainted with difficult roads. It was they who requested that their commanders send them home last so that they could cover their combat comrades returning from Afghanistan and defend them with their own life. Those who have already returned home are actively abetting restructuring thorugh their concrete and useful labor and are becoming as essential as they were before.

On 3 February at the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee there was a frank and beneficial discussion of a broad range of problems of interest to both the reserve personnel who had carried out their international duty and the republic leadership. The participants sharply disclosed instances of formalism and an inattentive and at times callous attitude to those who out of the calling of their conscience and upon orders of the motherland came to the aid of the people of Afghanistan.

We know well many of our compatriots who in Afghanistan demonstrated examples of courage and loyalty, said Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary Ye.Ye. Sokolov in his speech. Some 3,605 men were awarded orders and medals. Four soldiers were awarded the high title of Hero of the Soviet Union. Two of them—Nikolay Chepik and Andrey Melnikov—received this posthumously. Our people bow their heads to those who perished in Afghanistan. We will never forget the feats of the internationalist soldiers.

Under extreme conditions the finest qualities of the young men and women were manifested and their characters tempered. The internationalist soldiers related that the greatest punishment was not being taken into battle. A bullet, it turns out, was not as terrible as dishonor and the disdain of fellow servicemen.

Tempered in the fatal clashes with the dushman, many of yesterday's representatives of our valorous army are behaving in peacetime labor as in battle. The holder of the Order of the Red Star, Petr Petrashkevich, who lost a leg, decided to become an equipment operator. The Minsk tractor builders assembled a special machine for him with manual controls, and now he is working on one of the collective farms [kolkhoz] in Vileyskiy Rayon. His example has been followed by Gennadiy Brovko from the Vitebsk area.

Involvement in public affairs, a desire to be useful, a heightened feeling of justice and an implacable struggle for it—this is the main thing that brings together and unites the brothers in arms.

We must particularly mention the active involvement in social life and the great and beneficial indoctrination work among the youth and juveniles. Many former internationalist soldiers have been elected to the party bureaus and party committees, they head Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist League] organizations and work in the primary DOSAAF [Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy] organizations. In the republic there are 190 councils and clubs for reserve military. Sections of internationalist soldiers have been set up under the rayon, city and oblast war and labor veterans councils. The former internationalist soldiers Pavel Shetko (a lecturer at the Minsk Komsomol Obkom [oblast party committee]) and Mikhail Oshurkevich (an electric welder at the Pinsk Specialized Mobile Mechanized Column No 11) have been proposed as candidates for the USSR People's Deputies.

The party and soviet bodies, the social organizations show constant concern for the former internationalist soldiers, the disabled, and the families of deceased personnel and work to meet their material and domestic needs and requests.

However, things are not going well everywhere. There are still instances of an inattentive and bureaucratic approach. We must fight this decisively and prevent formalism and bureaucracy in dealings with the men.

The executive committees [ispolkom] of the oblast soviets and the Minsk City Soviet must, together with the appropriate ministries and departments, review and resolve the questions of accelerating the repairs on the apartments and houses of the internationalist soldiers and the families of deceased personnel, grant them preference in installing telephones, provide a 50-percent reduction on the cost of medicines for the children of deceased military personnel as well as the gratis support of them in children's preschool institutions.

Of course, all of this requires additional outlays, but I feel that our people will understand this correctly.

Ye.Ye. Sokolov went on to take up the questions of the more active involvement of young reserve military personnel in restructuring and in implementing the major tasks of a political, economic, and social nature confronting the republic.

Positive changes will occur faster the more actively youths participate in carrying out these tasks. They are doing a good deal toward carrying out or deeds more successfully and in a fimer and more confident pace. There are many examples of good deeds.

It is very important not to allow hesitation and not to permit oneself to be misled from the path put down by the 27th CPSU Congress and the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Among the youth it is essential to more boldly rebuff the demagogues and idlers, the various sorts of extremists who endeavor by fancy phrases to achieve their own personal ambitious goals.

Encouraged by the political demagogues, an ideologically immature portion of the youth would like to use the situation arising in the process of the democratizing of society for their own selfish goals.

Facts show that there are more frequent attempts by certain independent formations, basically among the youth, to apply pressure on officials, deputies of the local soviets, and the candidates for USSR People's Deputies.

The extremists and political demagogues, in speculating on the real difficulties of the restructuring processes and in the shortcomings in socioeconomic development, are endeavoring to excite political and social tension in society.

It is essential to learn to see who is who and to provide a principled political assessment for the programs and practical actions of the independent associations from the viewpoint of their conformity to the goals of the revolutionary renewal of society and the obligatory consideration of the real involvement of the association's members in carrying out the specific tasks of a socioeconomic and ideological nature.

It is important to provide energetic support for the independent social organizations which actively assist restructuring and the democratizing of Soviet society not in words but in concrete deeds. At the same time, we must decisively and publically, from Marxist-Leninist positions, rebuff those leaders who, in hiding behind demagogic slogans, endeavor to undermine restructuring and push the masses along a path of illegality, anarchy, the destabilizing of the situation and the fanning of interethnic hostility.

Often falling under the influence of the leaders of the various formations is the youth which does not have firm ideological convictions and experience in life. Personal work must be organized with such individuals. It is essential to switch their energy to deeds in the interests of restructuring. The former internationalist soldiers can do a great deal in this regard. It is important that they collaborate more closely with the Komsomol committees, take a more active part in their work, help establish in Komsomol life tenacity and militance and drive out of the Komsomol milieu all existing instances of bureaucracy, callousness, and formalism.

Ye.Ye. Sokolov described in detail the course of implementing the plans for the socioeconomic development of the republic over the 3 years of the current 5-year plan. He drew attention of those present to such problems as food and housing; increased production and a broadened assortment of consumer goods; improved medical, trade, and domestic services for the public; and conservation of the environment. The republic possesses great reserves and opportunities for solving these and many other questions related to improving the standard of living of the people. The main task is to put these opportunities to work fully.

There is much for us to do, said the speaker in conclusion, there is work ahead both extensive and intense. We are counting on the very active involvement of the Komsomol, the youths, and the reserve internationalist soldiers in them.

The "Afghaners" [veterans] are a militant and ardent people. They did not have to be summoned to the rostrum. The fellows in civvies and in military field uniforms the folds of which still had the dust of the scorching roads, themselves took the floor. They spoke freely, directly, and honestly. About the problems of labor and social rehabilitation, education, and recreation. Many of the questions raised by the speakers were settled by the republic leadership immediately here in the auditorium. For example, the 450 juveniles from the Vitebsk Military Patriotic Club who had almost lost hope of acquiring sports uniforms and supplies will receive these in the very near future. The participants in the meeting prevented a break for the First Secretary of the Belorussian Communist Party Central Committee Ye.Ye. Sokolov. They came up, shared their problems and sought advice. There was an involved and frank discussion.

Those assembled listened attentively to the words of Pavel Shetko, a candidate for the USSR people's deputies and lecturer at the Minsk Komsomol Obkom.

"My comrades and I fought in Afghanistan out of conviction that we were defending peaceful people. We fought because of civil duty and because of our military oath which is a law for a soldier, and we emerged from these harsh trials with honor. For this reason we find it insulting when our 'Afghaner' fellows are called a

'depressed' and 'lost' generation. Yes, broken persons can also be found in the southern resorts. But they are also among us. But look in the university auditoriums, the plant shops, and the scientific laboratories. Look how yesterday's soldiers study zealously there, work at full speed and fervently fight against the bureaucrats. No, we are not a lost generation! We have returned in order to think, argue, and do things together with all of us. We carefully safeguard our battle decorations, and the scars from our wounds will remain all our lives. But we do not wear on our shoulders any invisible shoulderboards, we do not intend to inject military procedures into restructuring, to shout or give orders. We are aware that restructuring is essential, and we will fight for it just as honestly as we fought in Afghanistan!"

Igor Gerasimov, the chairman of the Vitebsk Internationalist Soldier Council supported his comrade in arms:

"For myself I know how difficult it is for the young fellows after returning from the war. It is difficult to settle down immediately in peacetime life. Many problems appear. The main one is housing. Of course we have preferential treatment, but we have also seen the ruins of Spitak and Leninakan and we know about the villages in Tajikistan which have been buried alive. We have resolved not to cry on the shoulders of others and request apartments. We have set up our own 'Afghaner' MZhK [Youth Housing Construction Cooperative] and are building the housing ourselves. New comfortable housing will soon be rising on Internationalist Soldier Street."

Many speeches were permeated by anguish for the fellows who needed the most elementary medicines, material support and simple human contact and sympathy.

"Many social organizations are obliged to help the former internationalist soldiers," said Nikolay Matskevich, the chairman of the Minsk Oblast Veterans Council. "But up to now the veterans have lacked prostheses and not all of them have been provided with specially outfitted vehicles. When I am asked how many have received a pension, it is shameful for me to admit and I am forced to lie.... It is not easy for them to find a job within their capability. As yet no bureaucrat or paperpusher encountered on the path of the 'Afghaner' has been punished for his callous attitude. This will be the case as long as we are not provided with legal defense."

The Commander of the Red Banner Belorussian Military District, Lieutenant General A.I. Kostenko, said the following on the employment of the rich experience of the "Afghaners" who had undergone the harsh schooling of military life:

"Presently the army is receiving many morally untempered and physically weak men. One in three cannot chin himself several times and is incapable of a short forced march. On the other hand, the young men who have attended the military patriotic clubs, where their mentors are yesterday's internationalist soldiers, are already almost fully trained soldiers. It would be a good thing if every young man underwent this schooling in patriotism and courage. The district command is ready to supply the clubs with military equipment and clothing that has served its effective life and provide them with ranges and training centers for exercises."

The meeting with the reserve internationalist soldiers ran far beyond the time assigned for it. This frank conversation was continued even after its end in the offices of the officials, in the auditorium and corridors, and many troublesome problems were resolved.

Taking part in the meeting were Comrades V.G. Baluyev, V.I. Boris, N.I. Dementey, V.G. Yevtukh, N.S. Igrunov, V.A. Lepeshkin, V.A. Pechennikov, G.S. Tarezevich, and V.I. Goncharik.

Health Official on Chernovtsy Thallium Poisoning

PM0604180089 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 13, 26 Mar 89 p 4

[Interview with USSR Deputy Minister of Public Health Aleksandr Baranov by Andrey Borodenkov: "Source of Chernovtsy Health Hazard Remains a Mystery"]

[Text] In the wake of the mysterious cases six months ago in Chernovtsy of children losing all their hair, commissions were set up to investigate. Their conclusion: The children were suffering from thallium salts poisoning. But "MN" is still receiving collective letters of alarm—signed by dozens of local residents—claiming that the source of the thallium in the city's atmosphere has still not been found and children are continuing to lose their hair. Independent investigative groups have cropped up: the consensus is that the state organizations are concealing the truth. Our Andrey Borodenkov asked USSR Deputy Minister of Public Health Aleksandr Baranov (who headed a special commission) to comment:

[Baranov] Unfortunately, the source has not yet been discovered. But there is speculation that the source is car exhaust: the disease is most pronounced in the oldest and most polluted part of the city with the heaviest traffic and poorest air circulation. Frankly. It's not our job to try to uncover the source of this pollution. We have given the material we collected to the Procurator's Office which is investigating."

[Borodenkov] Letters from Chernovtsy mention that the R&D institute of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs is said to have prepared a report on request from the local Procurator's Office. The report alleged does not mention thallium, but boron discovered in the affected children in quantities several times the norm.

[Baranov] I know about this study. But boron poisoning, a frequent occurrence, never causes loss of hair, whereas salts from certain heavy metals do. Of course, boron could aggravate the effect of such salts.

Thallium has been revealed by a number of tests which makes us 100 per cent sure that our conclusions are right.

[Borodenkov] Chernovtsy residents do not seem satisfied with the commissions' work. They do not believe the report blaming a one-time-only atmosphereic discharge. Children are still getting sick and number of actual cases is almost twice the official figure, according to one independent group. Yet the official commissions have ended their investigations without pinpointing the source of the poison or prescribing preventive measures.

[Baranov] People's concern is understandable. But first, let's discuss the data supplied by that independent group. Who did they count as diseased? Their data makes no sense since they included even people with only bald patches. We have said many times that our task is to reveal the scale of thallium poisoning that has caused complete baldness. Any other baldness is common enough and can be blamed on a range of possible causes, from anaemia to nervous disorders. Lumping different cases together can only cause confusion. As for the allegation that Chernovtsy residents are being left to the mercy of the fates, it is unfounded. We are dealing with a unique case, the first even in the world. Thus we have decided to continue our work in Chernovtsy for a year, two years, or however long it takes. Affected and unaffected children alike must be submitted to regular medical checkups over a long period. The local medical college has been ordered to set up a special laboratory to study the medical and ecological aspects of this matter. And the Ministry of Public Health has proposed having a complex study programme designed for Chernovtsy.

[Borodenkov] What about now? What can be done to help local residents and their children?

[Baranov] We believe the thallium pollution is now many times lower than it was, though we don't know if it's completely gone.

Bykovnya Grave Site Confirmed To Hold Purge Victims
18000764 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 5 Apr 89 p 2

[Article by Sergey Kiselev, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent in the Ukraine: "The Bykovnya Archipelago"]

[Text] The version relayed in our newspaper (LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, 30 November 1988) that victims of Stalinist repressions —rather than victims of German occupiers, as is stated on the monument erected here in May of last year—lie buried in the forest in the vicinity of Bykovnya, not far from Kiev, has been fully confirmed.

This is the conclusion of the investigative team of the Kiev City Procurator's Office which started a criminal investigation in conjunction with the facts in our publication. By using objects bearing individual attributions of their owners (a book-plate, a monogrammed comb, and so forth), the investigation has already succeeded in identifying 14 innocent persons subjected to repressions whose remains rest here.

Among them are Nikolay Genrikhovich Ivanovskiy, construction technician of the resort directorate, shot on 10 December 1937; Valentina Makarovna Prokopovich, shot on 10 May 1938; Vladimir Antonovich Bryl, the brother of the famous Belorussian writer Yanka Bryl, division manager of the Rudyan sugar beet state farm (in Kiev Oblast). At the grave site, a cigarette holder with the inscription "Bryl V. A. 16 September 1937" was found. He was sentenced by "a panel of three" on 28 September 1938 and shot on 5 October of the same year.

Eleven more persons shot in 1937 and were identified on the basis of engravings on the lids of watches bearing their names. They are Tvardovskiy-Rebik, Anton Yeliseyevich, an employee of the People's Commissariat of Finance of the Ukrainian SSR; Tkalnikov, Fedor Yakovlevich, quartermaster's officer, 3d degree; militia employees Davydov-Varga, Emmanuil Markovich and Shelygin, Yakov Pavlovich; NKVD employees Mitselmakher, Abram Lazarevich; Yakovenko, Vladimir Mikhaylovich; Kostyanoy, Nikolay Stepanovich; and others. Their standard charges were counterrevolutionary and saboteur-terrorist activities, espionage, and so on.

Employees on the investigative team believe that the names of several thousand more persons buried in the Bykovnya forest may be identified in an indirect manner. They have proven that the green fence behind which the people shot were buried in common trenches on an area of 4 hectares belonged to the NKVD, and that corpses were brought here in trucks. The people were exterminated in the basement of what now is the October Palace of Culture where at the time the NKVD was located. There are witnesses who saw corpses being loaded on the trucks here and covered with canvas (incidentally, about 200 witnesses were questioned in the case of grave sites in the Bykovnya forest.)

It looks like everything secret associated with the Bykovnya archipelago will become public. However, it is alarming that the greatest triumph of restoring the historic and legal justice may be marred by an incomplete disclosure again. Voices are already being heard from on high suggesting that the investigation be wound down in order not to bring about the exhumation of the Bykovnya grave sites, to a complete elucidation of circumstances which may come to light as a result of such excavations. On 23 February, the Dneprovskiy Party Rayon Committee of the city of Kiev laid wreaths to the "victims of fascism" at the monument....

I would like to believe that the monument with the dishonest inscription will be removed and that the remains of people subjected to repressions reburied under it will be thoroughly studied one more time along

with the exhumation of other graves; that the investigation will not restrict itself to Bykovnya alone but will take interest in other addresses in Kiev (say, the Lukyanovskoye Cemetery) where victims of Stalinist repressions are also buried.

Gdlyan's Conduct of Churbanov Case Criticized

PM0404132589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Apr 89 Morning Edition p 3

["Letter to the Editorial Office" from Major General of Justice, Retired, F. Titov, followed by Yu. Feofanov commentary: "Nostalgia for the 'Queen'..."]

[Text] I recently attended a TRUD "talking newspaper" session addressed by T.Kh. Gdlyan, senior investigator for especially important cases under the USSR general prosecutor and leader of the group investigating the case of Churbanov and others. The topic of his speech was "Legal Reform and Restructuring, the Struggle Against Organized Crime." It was, alas, a stream of—to put it mildly—uncomplimentary accusations and even insulting and slanderous charges against the Supreme Court and its leaders, and against the country's courts in general.

Having painted an unsavory picture of the situation regarding crime, Comrade Gdlyan asked:

"Why has such a situation developed?" And he answered: "Because the courts have brought about this situation through incorrect verdicts and miscarriages of justice over the last few years; this is how they understand restructuring. The courts' work is now appraised according to the number of acquittals and cases referred for further investigation: The more the better."

Speaking about the case against Churbanov and others, he placed special emphasis on criticism of the verdict: There was, he claimed, no justification for excluding matters on which the accused had admitted their guilt during the preliminary investigation.

At the end of his speech Gdlyan offered the following summation: "Whereas the innocent used to be shot under Vyshinskiy, the courts are now acquitting the guilty."

This is not an isolated speech; similar statements can be heard even on television. But I would not have dwelt on them had I not been perturbed by the fate of our judicial system and the legal reform. There can be no question of any rule-of-law state unless the courts and judges are freed from crude pressure and unless strict liability is established for insults to courts and judges. The court must decide: Has the charge been proved or not? If not, it must acquit regardless of the political motives which prompted the charge.

People might wonder why I am reacting so sharply to the aforementioned facts. I have been retired on pension for 15 years now. But the speeches of Gdlyan and Ivanov [investigator associate of Gdlyan] reminded me of something that happened 26 years ago, when I was chairman of a military tribunal and was subjected to as much defamation as Marov [chairman of Churbanov tribunal] is now, because I was in the chair when submarine commander Captain 2d Rank A.S. Begeba was acquitted of a charge.

A few words about the salient points of the case. An explosion occurred on a diesel-electric submarine more than 25 years ago. People lost their lives. A government commission arrived on the scene. The results of its work were examined by the CPSU Central Committee Presidium. In addition to the organizational conclusions, the following point was also made: Submarine Commander Begeba should be sent for trial. On this basis, the USSR defense minister issued an appropriate order.

So the six volumes of the criminal case landed up on my desk. Begeba was charged with having failed to take every possible measure to enter the submarine while the fire was raging inside it and to organize work to prevent the explosion. Furthermore, as investigators do in such cases, Begeba was also charged with service omissions which had occurred 18-24 months earlier; this is a fairly widespread method: if the main charge does not stick, judge the man for old sins.

The court most painstakingly investigated everything, down to the most trivial details, and, having spent exactly 12 hours in the conference room, acquitted Begeba. In our opinion, he had done everything possible in the circumstances to enter the submarine, but that had proved impossible.

It was only by a miracle that Begeba had survived: He had run up to the conning tower, out of which black smoke and flames were pouring with an increasingly loud roar, and had nevertheless decided to run this fiery gauntlet, but the first small explosion (bang) occurred at that moment, throwing Begeba off the pier into the water, and a powerful explosion followed right away.

The court concluded that, in these circumstances, Begeba could not be found guilty of the loss of human life and of the submarine. The court also rejected the "routine" matters on the charge sheet.

The consequences of Begeba's acquittal were almost as impressive as the explosion of the submarine itself. The judges were accused of all sorts of things, but attention focused mainly on the fact that we had ignored the government commission's conclusions and the Central Committee Presidium's decision. I will make no secret of the fact that fuel was added to the fire by the Navy prosecutor, now deceased, who literally said the following to the fleet commander and member of the Military Council in my presence:

"We will overrule this unprecedentedly disgraceful decision and Begeba will be sentenced...."

And now, applying those selfsame methods to the case of bribe-takers from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, Investigators Gdlyan and Ivanov are striving to create a negative attitude toward the verdict among the public and to—bluntly speaking—inflame passions among the people; they are doing their best to discredit the administration of justice. And yet, strictly speaking, the verdict clearly indicates that by no means everything in the investigation of this complex case was as it should have been, and that serious breaches were committed. The preliminary investigation deviated from the law's demands as regards the impermissibility of basing charges on assumptions. Having obtained affidavits from those under investigation admitting their guilt, in many instances the investigators failed to take the necessary measures to obtain and evaluate evidence which would have provided objective proof of guilt. These breaches led to others: a breach of the demands of Article 77 of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Code of Criminal Procedure finding expression in the fact that a sizable proporti n of the charges were based only on admissions by the accused, whereas the second part of this article of the law demands: "...An admission of guilt by the accused can serve as a basis for a charge **only** (my emphasis—F.T.) when the admission is corroborated by the totality of evidence available in the case." But what happens in cases when there is nothing but an admission of guilt by the accused himself? There can be only one answer if we respect the existing laws: Dismiss the case.

Admission of guilt by the accused in the course of investigation, which for a long time was preferred over all other evidence, was dubbed the "queen of evidence." It is well known that its theoretical substantiation was provided by A. Vyshinskiy's book "Theory of Judicial Evidence." The use of this "theory" made it possible to conduct unjustified mass repressions of Soviet people during the period of the Stalin personality cult. It is to be deeply regretted that, as practice shows, many officials from law enforcement organs, especially from investigating organs, pay obeisance to this notorious "queen" and thus contribute to serious flaws in investigating and judicial practice.

[Signed] Major General of Justice, Retired, F. Titov

The writer asked that his letter be published on the eve of the elections. But the editorial office deemed it tactless to print it at that time: Telman Khorenovich Gdlyan was running for election as candidate USSR people's deputy. Now he has been elected. It might seem all the more inappropriate to publish the above instead of congratulations, but there's no escaping it: As the saying goes (said, true enough, in a different context)—I cannot remain silent.

I attended Churbanov's trial from beginning to end and heard the testimony of the accused and the witnesses: Yes, many retracted the confessions made during the preliminary investigation. The usual story. The unusual aspect was that the judges and other participants in the trial did not turn a deaf ear to this testimony. And this proved to be something to which the investigators were unaccustomed. One can understand their annoyance and even anger—they are human. Marx described shame as inwardly directed anger. In this case, the anger was outward, even though the quality of the evidence submitted to the court is indicated by the fact that, even before the verdict, the state prosecutor dismissed one-half of the charges filed against Churbanov—they had not been proved.

Nevertheless, the verdict aroused anger and annoyance. And so did the judges passing it. Or rather, Judge M. Marov, because as far as I can see, the lay assessors are not mentioned anywhere. On the other hand, there are reproaches against V. Terebilov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Court.

Reproaches—this is of course putting it too mildly. For 3 months now the investigators have been downright insulting to the judges in a whole series of newspapers—VODNYY TRANSPORT, MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, SOVETSKAYA TATARIYA—as well as on Leningrad Television and Moscow Radio, accusing them of almost a conspiracy against justice: shielding criminals, deliberately distorting evidence, and adopting a blatantly biased attitude toward the incriminating evidence gathered by them, the investigators. And all this, so T. Gdlyan and his colleague N. Ivanov claim, was prompted by the judge's personal interest.

This is almost a criminal charge. But investigators, of all people, ought to know that charges must be proved. Let us take a close look at the evidence. Marov once served on a military tribunal in the Turkmen Military District, where Kakhramanov (acquitted by the court) lived and worked; consequently, Marov and Kakhramanov could have known each other. And if they could have known each other, this means that contacts between them were also **possible.** And if there were contacts, then there were relations. Relations, in turn, can be "healthy" or "unhealthy." If the latter, then why not suppose personal interest in the fate of the accused Kakhramanov? And there you have the "evidence."

Jurists Gdlyan and Ivanov are perfectly well aware of the term used to describe this: "objective imputation" —if someone had an opportunity to commit an offense, all that is left to do is prove that he did so. This was the underlying principle throughout 1937; this was the basis on which the "Vitebsk case" was built already in our time. This was the basis for dozens of cases which are now ending in acquittals. "Objective imputation" is the most cynical tool of the inculpatory bias which is rejected by our law and all others. The same scheme was used to cast an accusation against the chairman of the

USSR Supreme Court—he was elected a deputy from Uzbekistan, where Kakhramanov lived at the time; Marov worked in the same building as Terebilov, and therefore....

I do not know what Comrades Marov and Terebilov think of all this; that is their business. But if such methods of accusation are cultivated in investigators' practical work, the results could be dreadful for anyone falling within the orbit of their power. I heard a witness testifying during Churbanov's trial. When he failed to give the testimony the investigators wanted he was locked up; when he told them what they wanted he was let out; he wrote a letter to A.A. Gromyko repenting that he had slandered innocent people under pressure from the investigators and was locked up again 3 days later. This episode came out during the trial, and it is a pity that the court did not deem it necessary to order an independent investigation of it.

The letter from Maj Gen of Justice F. Titov lists breaches of procedural law which he thinks were committed. They were known even before Churbanov's trial. And they caused alarm: Is it permissible to keep people locked up for years before trial if the time limit laid down by law is not more than 9 months? The investigators in breach of the time limit had a reliable cover: authorization from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium. But all these acts by the legislators are unlawful—this must be bluntly said. The law does not grant such a prerogative even to the legislators themselves. It is no accident that the texts of these acts are not to be found in the VEDOMOSTI VERKHOVNOGO SOVETA SSSR—they are not to be found anywhere—and therefore they cannot have the status of law. But they are used to keep people in jail for 3, 4, or even more years.

I have sincere respect for the difficult job of Telman Khorenovich Gdlyan and Nikolay Veniaminovich Ivanov; they are consistent fighters against high-ranking embezzlers of state funds and—I can say this without any exaggeration—their labor has gained them the people's respect. But how can selflessness in the struggle against crime or the dangerous nature of the crimes justify even the slightest disregard for the law? This is why last September, right at the start of Churbanov's trial, I offered T. Gdlyan the opportunity to openly discuss the legality of investigations of cases involving embezzlement and bribery in a "juridical dialogue" on IZVESTIYA's pages. For my part, I submitted an outline of the dialogue. The top copy is still with my intended interlocutors, and I am still holding on to the carbon copy. The dialogue itself never took place.

But such a dialogue is necessary. Not necessarily with me. With any unbiased jurist or journalist. It is necessary because the slightest deviation from the law compromises the struggle against the mafia, not to say altogether wrecks it. It is not difficult to see that it is not judges' leniency that saves criminals from punishment; it is dubious evidence and unproved charges placed before the court. We must rejoice that courts have ceased copying out the indictments to serve as verdicts, that they reject **any old** means of struggle against crime and demand **only lawful ones.**

But now we have the "Vremya" program showing millions of rubles on our television screens. This is impressive, of course. Nonetheless, I would like to know: Have these millions been confiscated by the court? Have their owners been sentenced? Or is this just a method of exciting public passions so that, should the charges not be proved, accusations could be made?... Everyone saw what had been plundered from the people, and now look at the judges.... And everything else that is now being thrown at the Churbanov trial judges.

In their public statements, the investigators express the hope that the sentence will be appealed, which, of course, cannot be ruled out. This is important, but it is nevertheless a different matter. Judges' dignity must be protected against insults during a case's twists and turns. The state must show concern for this. Provided, of course, that it wishes to be ruled by law and has self-respect.

I would very much like to see the public taking a sober look at things. Everything is so complex. People are fascinated by the millions shown on television; they are indignant when thieves in office are named. This seems to be taken as justification for disregard for the law. But if some other reasons—even the most imperative ones—prevail over the law, what sort of rule-of-law state are we talking about? The "queen of evidence" will once more start determining people's fate.

Economic

Gostev Views Government Finance Plan

18200299 Moscow TRUD in Russian
2 Apr 89 p 1

[Report by Yu. Krasnopolskiy on a news conference given by B. I. Gostev: "How To Overcome the State Budget Deficit"; date of conference not given]

[Text] A news conference held at the USSR Ministry of Finance was dedicated to the issues of the financial situation, measures for economic recovery, and the strengthening of the country's money exchange. USSR Finance Minister B. I. Gostev appeared before journalists.

"The country's current financial situation is complex and tense," he said. "Despite a number of positive moves in the economy during 1988, the 1989 deficit in financial resources was approximately R100 billion. By such an amount does overall government spending exceed income.

"The growth rate of labor productivity lagged behind the growth rate in salaries significantly. In summation, if the population's monetary income grew by about R40 billion, then the commodity circulation grew by only R25 billion. You do not have to be an economist to compare these indices and understand that when there is a lot of money, and few goods, a devaluation of national currency occurs. Today, for example, the population has piled up significantly more money than the sum of the products that the national economy can offer.

"Among the reasons for this is the insufficient growth of labor efficacy, ongoing large losses in production, low production quality, and supply disruptions, which led to unfulfilled plans on the part of a number of major branches and state supply in the past year. Nor can other circumstances be ignored. In recent years, we have lost R40 billion of income as a result of the drop in the world price for petroleum products. Supplemental allocation of an additional R18 billion was necessary for the resolution of immediate problems of improvement in medical care and workers' social security. The Chernobyl tragedy cost us R8 billion, and this is not the final figure. Eliminating the effects of the Armenian earthquake will demand no small expense.

"How can the budget deficit be met? One of the measures is a loan of credit resources from the state loan fund of a sum of over R63 billion. That is, in the given case, the government acts as a client bank, and must return to it this sum with a set interest rate. This is not an uncommon thing in world financial-credit practice. But then there is R35 billion not covered by credit or by any other funds. What sources may be used to meet this? There is only one way: reduce expenditures. It has been proposed that the volume of central capital investment in construction be reduced by R7.5 billion by ceasing to throw money at uncompleted construction, and by postponing until better times the construction of less important projects. Furthermore, as has already been reported in the press, expenditures on military needs will be reduced by 14.2 percent, with no loss in the country's defense capabilities. Expenditures on the central apparatus of ministries and departments will be reduced by no less than 10 percent.

"The economists' calculations indicate that if, on a national scale, we accelerate the rate of turnover of the circulating capital by even one percent, this will free up R8 billion. We waste R11 billion annually on subsidies to enterprises operating at a loss. If we reduce their number by even a third, that would be a hefty addition to the budget."

Other opportunities to counteract the financial deficit were named at the press conference. In particular, the regulation of growth rate correspondences for productive labor and wages was discussed, as well as increasing the sale of goods for the people by R12 billion. Taken in its entirety, complete fulfillment of the measures outlined by the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers must stabilize the country's financial situation in 1989-1990, creating the necessary preconditions for its further fortification.

In essence, for many years, we ate up our saved wealth, and spent more than we earned. The state Budget deficit did not appear today or yesterday; it accrued gradually, without the people knowing about it. Now we know. We also know that restitution of what was wasted, the compounding of our public property, is hardly a quick and easy thing. We must work; there simply is no other choice.

Editor of New Foreign Trade Bulletin Interviewed

18070182 Moscow ARGUMENTY I FAKTY in Russian No 13, 1-7 Apr 89 pp 2-3

[Interview with V. Smirnov, editor in chief of Bulletin of Foreign Commercial Information, by unnamed correspondent from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY: "300 Joint Ventures Have Already Been Created: Information for Business Partners"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] Editor in chief of the "Bulletin of Foreign Commercial Information" [BIKI] V. Smirnov responds to questions from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Starting 1 April, hundreds of Soviet organizations, enterprises, and cooperatives will receive the right to enter the foreign market. There is no doubt that the problem of receiving foreign economic information acquires great practical significance for them.

[Smirnov] Indeed, abroad, there are thousands of periodical publications which contain commercial and economic information; commercial services of information agencies work around the clock; press-releases are published by banks, industrial associations, stock exchanges, and international organizations. The convenient thing to do in order to keep up with this stream is to use the base of collection and analysis of commercial information, created at the All-Union Scientific Research Institute of Economic Trends [VNIKI], particularly, the "Bulletin of Foreign Commercial Information" published by the institute. Information for this bulletin is received from correspondent points in New York, London, Paris, Tokyo, Bonn, and Delhi from the REUTER and AFP agencies. These communications receive prioritized processing: The most important and immediate of them appear on the pages of BIKI only 1-2 days after they are received. The bulletin describes the economic situation in particular countries, and offers the prognosis for the development of their economies. There is material on the situation in the primary commercial markets, including information on the state of the leading commercial stock exchanges, material on the state of economic trends in the market for agricultural machinery and equipment, and for raw materials for industry. Forecasts

are published; they are prepared by generally acknowledged economic organizations, leading banks, and industrial firms, as well as individual entrepreneurs. A special section of BIKI is devoted to hard currency financial information. We have given particular attention to summarizations of progressive experiments in various branches of the economy of foreign countries. At the present time, among the priority trends in information collection and processing are biotechnology, new construction materials, special chemicals, new means of food production, new computer technology, robots, and satellite communications links. Overview information on individual branches of industry may help reveal the content of new developments, help collect data on the firms and organizations realizing these developments; that is, to collect data not only for economic trends, but for prospecting, particularly for patent-licensing work.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] Organizations which have just ventured into the foreign market will need practical information as well: price levels, customs regulations in different countries, etc.

[Smirnov] Starting in April 1989 VNIKI will offer its three new publications: the monthly "Reference Book of Prices of the Capitalist Market," the quarterly "Herald of Trade Policy" and the "Bulletin of Hard-Currency Financial Information." The "Reference Book of Prices of the Capitalist Market" includes information which the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations has long used to determine contract prices. The new Soviet exporters and importers still do not have these prices on a regular basis. The "Reference Book" is called upon to fill these gaps. The "Herald of Trade Policy" will publish information on the governmental undertakings of foreign countries concerning issues of inter-state economic relations, and expert evaluations of these undertakings' possible influences on commercial activity of the Soviet organizations venturing into the foreign market. The "Bulletin of Hard-Currency Financial Information" will help Soviet organizations protect themselves against hard currency and credit risk while concluding foreign trade contracts, and to evaluate the payment capabilities of foreign countries.

[ARGUMENTY I FAKTY] And what if the associates are not qualified to use correctly the informational resources which you offer them?

[Smirnov] VNIKI takes orders for research work, commercial information collection, marketing program development, lectures, seminars, and offers consulting services. The country's only department for corporate research offers a service contract for receiving information on foreign companies.

Gradual Introduction of Market Prices Urged

18200293 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 30 Mar 89 p 2

[Article by Professor Yu. Borozdin, doctor of economic sciences : "Will the Bans Help Us?"]

[Text] At present, the issue of prices concerns all of us. I don't think it is necessary to explain exactly why. Here, however, is a matter which I think merits consideration. Why have recent measures aimed at price regulation been received ambiguously? The common expectation of some kind of measures in the sphere of price setting is quite understandable. However, "correct" administrative bans may only work when they are based on a correct appraisal of the economic situation, and do not contradict the objective manifestation of regularities which have emerged. Besides, when we resolve to go ahead with them we should precisely calculate the consequences. Let us analyze the latest resolution on prices from this point of view. What is the relationship of economic reality and its "documentary" reflection? The resolution notes that many enterprises are trying to increase their profits by raising prices, taking advantage of a considerable surplus of demand for goods over their supply, and of their monopoly situation. It goes on to deplore the practice of raising prices on the pretext of producing new merchandise which actually differs little from the old one. It expresses concern over the refusal of enterprises to produce inexpensive goods, and so forth. The question, however, is whether this is ill will, or a proper reaction to the objective condition of the market. Is this the fault of enterprises, or a behavior forced on them by the policy of the Gosplan and branch ministries?

The State Planning Committee [Gosplan] and the ministries, for the noble purpose of alleviating the shortage, strive to set for enterprises the highest possible plans for increasing the volume of production. In many instances, these plans are not bolstered by material resources, and enterprises are forced to resort to producing expensive goods. As a result, the gap between "production in natural units" and "value" not only fails to shrink but even grows, and social needs are met in an increasingly worse manner. It seems that in managing the national economy it still happens that the "right hand" does not know what the "left one" is doing, or does not want to know.

Is this not the reason why it is so hard to believe that the measures proposed will be fruitful? It is all the more so, because it is not difficult to guess what their consequences will be. The resolution sets forth the most important task for the State Committee on Prices and other organs: to overcome "the emerging negative trends." Can the USSR State Committee on Prices and other agencies handle this task under the present conditions? Hardly, primarily because administrative bans cannot eliminate excessive demand. For example, the resolution eliminates the OM [high fashion], VK [high

quality], MOL [children's goods], and other indices. Contract and temporary prices will not be set for goods for children, as well as for merchandise for senior citizens. Of course, some indices may be abolished, temporary and contract prices can be restricted or eliminated, but the laws of the market cannot be abolished! How will they manifest themselves?

Through unsatisfied demand mounting further inasmuch as state enterprises will not be interested in increasing the production of goods in short supply, and in a pick-up in the shadow economy yet again. Regardless of whether the goods in short supply are with or without an index they will inevitably have a second price which brings demand and supply into balance. However, it is not state enterprises that are going to do business at this price, and the proceeds will go to coffers other than those of the state. We may call this price speculative, we may reinforce police measures; however, it is better (and more efficient!) to solve economic problems by economic methods. Could it be that such prices which do not balance demand and supply (they are also called "socially motivated low" [prices]) create a certain advantage for the low-income groups of consumers? Yes, but only if these buyers have an opportunity to freely purchase goods at these low prices. However, if they are freely sold, then they are not in short supply, and the prices are not at all "socially motivated low," but regular equilibrium prices. In the case the shortage persists only those representatives of low-income groups will win who are "closer" to the goods in short supply.

It is clear that "reinforced control" will not and cannot make the life of the average person easier, just as it cannot make the goods-and-money relations among enterprises themselves healthier. For example, the resolution acknowledges that the practice of "setting excessive contract prices" is unacceptable, that is, it apparently demands that "The Regulations on Procedures for Setting Contract Wholesale Prices for Producer and Technical Goods and Services of a Production Nature by Enterprises" be complied with. What does this document contain? It instructs that contract prices be set (understandably, this term becomes a mere convention) strictly in keeping with the cost-oriented principles on which the current methods and practices of price setting are based. However, it fundamentally contradicts the new principles of management, and real processes in the economy. This is why nobody complies with it, and not at all because the state committee has not been sufficiently strict thus far. The same may be said about the so-called "ceiling prices" which supposedly provide for the growth of consumer features outstripping that of outlays. However, they have been a part of various resolutions for more than 20 years now, and there has not been any "outstripping growth." Is this ill will yet again? Of course not. It is just that the producers themselves determine ceiling prices, and they have always found ways to set them at a level such that any outlays of theirs could be recouped.

What strategic course are we pursuing with regard to cooperatives? It appears that this is the course toward a complete subordination of cooperatives to state enterprises. Once again, the point of departure in this instance is noble. What about the possible consequences? The state supply, distribution, and price-setting system essentially turns cooperatives into branches of state enterprises with all the attendant consequences. Is this in line with the idea and initial principles of developing cooperatives? The administrative application of state prices, which do not keep the supply and demand in balance, in cooperative enterprises will bring about the preservation of shortages in the economy. In this case, why should we bother restoring the cooperative movement at all?

I understand that the reader may be inclined to ask a quite appropriate question. If the author is in favor of free market price setting, should he not also be in favor of an immediate reform in this area? No, I understand that we cannot afford a profound restructuring of the system of price setting under the current economic and political circumstances. However, we should not hamper the movement toward prices reconciling supply and demand which is natural in an environment of radical reform. Trying to go into the current is not only useless but also dangerous.

Certainly, we will have to regulate prices in an environment of the developing market as well. However, this should be accomplished not by restricting free economic operations but by encouraging them, not by putting constraints on market relations but by developing them. In this manner, we will prepare the country for the inevitable unified reform of prices and incomes which should be based on analyzing consumption baskets of various income brackets of the populace. I think that at the initial stage we will have to keep the centralized setting of retail prices for key goods of the consumption baskets, but only for key goods, only for 5 years with provisions in the 5-Year Plan, and only keeping in mind the prospect of giving up such a practice completely. The rest of price setting should vigorously move toward that of a free market. This, by the way, does not at all mean that the state will not defend the interests of consumers. It will, but by economic rather than police methods.

Readers on Production Property Ownership

18200287 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 25 Mar 89 p 2

[Roundup of readers' letters responding to article on production property ownership; for original article by R. Khasbulatov, see the 16 February Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 81, column two, under the headline "State-Monopoly Ownership Principle Challenged"]

[Text] *"Everything around belongs to the collective farm [kolkhoz], everything around belongs to me"; we have been repeating this with touching optimism for years. But if it is "mine" because someone "up there" gives it to me, how many cars should we make and how much grain*

should we sow? If it is "mine," may I not spoil it, waste it, squander it? But it is high time to admit that the reasons for the imperfections in ownership relations that took shape among us since the thirties have remained virtually unchanged to this very day.

State-monopoly socialism: This is how the essential nature of these relations was described by Professor R. Khasbulatov in his article "What Kind of Ownership Do We Have?" (SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 10 February 1989). Readers have been interested in the debate that has started.

Issues of ownership have been and remain basic in the radical restructuring of the economy. And practice shows that we do not have any ready-made solutions. How can the interests of the worker be combined with the interests of society? How can we overcome our alienation from the means of production? How can we make state ownership truly national? These and other subjects were touched upon in R. Khasbulatov's article and we plan to discuss them with you, the readers. We invite scholars and managers and all those looking for new ways in both theory and practice to take part in the discussion.

Today we publish the first comments on the article "What Kind of Ownership Do We Have?"

Enough of Slogan Therapy.

As is known, socialism is a system based on public ownership, and it eliminates the exploitation of man by man. Let us assume that we have achieved this. But the question arises: Then why has this most progressive form of ours been unable even to feed people? We have not yet managed to create a legal state on its basis, and we encounter social injustice at every step. Millions of people are living in communal apartments and barracks. In terms of life expectancy and infant mortality we are the level of the developing countries. Ecological catastrophe is imminent. Does this mean that classical Marxism was wrong when it placed public ownership on a pedestal? Or perhaps we do own property, as Khasbulatov thinks, but in a somewhat different way?

It is common knowledge that the characteristic sign of public ownership is the connection between workers and the means of production. It is they and no no one else who have the assets of production at their disposal. Neither is there any exploitation of man by man since owner and worker are embodied in the same person.

But in our reality, public ownership is misappropriated by a state apparatus in the form of ministries and departments and various public organizations, or, as they now say, the administrative-bureaucratic system.

I foresee objections. Even with all its shortcomings, they will say, state-monopoly ownership unites the national economy as one factory with a single management office. And this provides the opportunity for deliberate and purposeful control of production for the good of society. This idea is a fiction, a self-delusion. The crisis condition of our economy is convincing proof of this. With regard to the goals that the bureaucratic apparatus sets itself, they directly contradict the interests of the people. But even when interests coincide the good intentions just remain on paper. They do not enable the unprecedented scales of mismanagement to be brought to life. The worker has no interest in the results of his labor. The things he produces are for him someone's else's property. The result of this alienation is the "pilfering" in production, the epidemic of theft in trade and public catering, the casual attitude toward the individual in the services sphere, and the catastrophic destruction of nature and culture.

And how do our social scientists explain all this? Very simply: The inadequate development of the individual and public consciousness and blaming everything on the remnants of capitalism. And so we try to treat the social diseases with slogan therapy: "Economics should be economical," "Worker, you are the master of production." It would be possible to implement these slogans only if the workers were interested in the results of their labor not in words but in fact. But the administrative-bureaucratic system has placed direct producers in the position of hired workers. And here it has appropriated gratis the result of that hired labor—surplus value, which insures for itself conditions for its parasitic existence.

While producing no material blessings but having them at its disposal, the bureaucracy fears the loss of that capital. Hence its rabid resistance to restructuring.

However, there is no alternative to restructuring. Only radical transformations in the sphere of production relations can give us an opportunity to use the socioeconomic advantages of the socialist method of production and implement Lenin's concept of socialism.

What is required for this is first and foremost to overcome the alienation of producers from the means of production and the results of production. And to liberate the workers from exploitation by the bureaucratic apparatus. Combining ownership and labor becomes the economic basis for dealing with the social corrosion that took hold of all of society in the period of stagnation, that is, in the period of suppurating Stalinism.

How can this be achieved? By supporting the proposals of Professor R. Khasbulatov and augmenting them with our own.

The production of consumer goods must be developed in every possible way on the basis of the cooperative system. In agriculture unprofitable kolkhozes and state farms [sovkhozes] must be transformed into agricultural firms of the shareholder type or family farms based on

personal ownership of the means of production by the farmer, including land. The matter of augmenting state ownership of land with cooperative and personal ownership is extremely urgent.

Implementation of this program must be started as soon as possible, without waiting for the total collapse of the entire economy.

[Signed] V. Tretyakov, doctor of economic sciences, Moscow

Stop Playing with Words

Neither glasnost nor pluralism of opinion—the real and remarkable progeny of restructuring—can justify the pseudoscientific models of Professor Khasbulatov. Scathing terms mechanically borrowed from "another work" are still not enough to give rise to a really new scientific concept. It is astonishing why serious authors lead readers into error by propagandizing such schemes.

R. Khasbulatov, doctor of economic sciences, claims that in the USSR the "rudiments of Leninist socialism were suppressed" during the period of Stalin's dictatorship, and that "for decades another kind of socialism reigned—state-monopoly socialism. And it persists to this day."

Without getting involved in a discussion about the complexity of the situation I cannot agree with this author's innovations in the interpretation of state-monopoly ownership.

It is well known that there is monopolism and there is monopolism. Under different socioeconomic conditions it has different foundations. The monopolism of the Soviet ministries and departments is based on socialist state ownership, while the monopolism of present-day concerns in the United States, Japan, the FRG, and other countries in the West is based on **capitalist** private ownership.

V.I. Lenin brought the new, specific term "state-monopoly capitalism" into sociopolitical usage; it broadly describes the changes in the economics and politics of imperialism. Lenin's term accurately reflected the new economic and political situation—the interlocking of monopolies with the state in a single mechanism. Under the conditions of state-monopoly capitalism a new type of ownership naturally and objectively comes into being, namely, state-monopoly ownership. Under socialism this kind of ownership cannot exist—the essential conditions for it are lacking, that is, state-monopoly capitalism. Therefore we should not juggle with words and engage in unscientific economic fantasy.

[Signed] A. Demin, doctor of economic sciences, Leningrad

Points from Letters

Finally the major issue of ownership has been raised in our press. I fully share the opinion of R. Khasbulatov that commodity production is possible only when the producers of commodities own them. Wherein lies the strength of the ministries or other bureaucratic entities? In the fact that enterprises do not have the right to ownership. The only way to eliminate the strength of the bureaucracy is to transfer this ownership of the means of production (plants, land) to the labor collectives. Transferring ownership of the means of production to the labor collectives will make their material well-being dependent on their own labor.
[Signed] S. Chistyakov, Krivoy Rog

*****

Ah! this is a "revolutionary" break in production relations! Instead of learning at least the ABCs of management, we have r-r-revolutionary phrases coming out of the mouths of economists, whose sacred duty it is to improve existing forms for the organization of production and management. For 3 years cost accounting has not been working for us. We are unable to organize it because we are seeing everything in the light of "revolutionary changes." As we did in 1917, and in 1929. And in March 1953. And so on; all the great "salvos" of the "Aurora" directed against corn, chemicals, and other targets. But economics is not essentially the socialization of the means of production. And we still do not know what the essence of this socialization is and what its advantages are. And the author of the article does not know either. And because he does not know he is in error when he proposes that we rid ourselves of the negative aspects of our management system through the liquidation of the sector ministries.
[Signed] V. Sobolev, Dnepropetrovsk

*****

I agree on the whole with the content of the article but I must express some bewilderment: Why would it be necessary to introduce into scientific usage the concept of "state-monopoly socialism" by analogy with state-monopoly capitalism?
[Signed] A. Kolubayev, Chimkent

*****

It so happens that the state has yielded up the means of production to the ministries and departments, which have become the sole owners. Legally this dominion is based on the thousands of instructions and orders. Through their rights as owners the ministries confer the surplus value produced by the enterprises as crumbs into the budget.
[Signed]V. Botvin, Tolyatti

Agricultural

Government Creates New Agricultural Commission

LD1004101789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0940 GMT 10 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow, 10 Apr (TASS)—In connection with the expansion of the powers and responsibilities of Soviet republics on issues of food supplies, the USSR Government has abolished the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee and created the State Commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on Food and Procurements as a government standing body. This is stated in a USSR Council of Ministers decision published here today "On Improvement of Food Supplies to the Country's Population on the Basis of Fundamental Enhancement of the Efficiency and the Further Development of Agroindustrial Production."

The USSR Council of Ministers stresses that given the great difficulties being experienced in supplying the population with foodstuffs it is essential to make the utmost use of the potential of the national economy, to carry out organizational and practical work at a fundamentally new level, and to radically change the content of this work. It is essential to do everything possible in order to revive the interests of a real proprietor in every worker. This road alone will make it possible for serious successes to be achieved in the implementation of the new party agrarian policy and for the state of affairs to be changed, first and foremost in the primary link of production. For this to be done, the entire arsenal of economic, organizational, and legal means must be used, and the restructuring of economic relations, collective, family and lease contracting, cooperatives, and the development of diverse forms of property relations must be made paramount.

The decision maps out an improvement of economic relations in the agroindustrial complex, the regulation of its mutual relations with other branches of the national economy, and a definition of the prospects for development of the complex. It envisages the drafting of major state-wide programs to build up food resources in the country, taking into account the fullest utilization of the capabilities of every region.

A most important task of the councils of ministers of union and autonomous republics, and the executive committees of kray, oblast, town, and rayon soviets of people's deputies is to take charge of this work. It is necessary to promote in every way the development of democratic forms of management. Particular attention should be paid to the training and upbringing of economically literate, professionally trained workers with an all-round education. It is now a most important task to raise the prestige of a peasant's labor, and to ensure consistent progress and improvement in food supplies for the country's population.

Agriculture Conference Held in Brest 6-7 Apr

Ligachev Delivers Report

PM0704151189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Apr 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Peasant Initiative"]

[Excerpts] The experience accumulated in many parts of the country convincingly attests that the acuteness of the food problem can be relieved more quickly if we take a comprehensive approach to resolving it and utilize not only the potential of collective farms [kolkhozes] and state farms [sovkhozes] but also the reserves at the disposal of industrial enterprises' subsidiary farms and private plots, as well as collective horticulture and truck farming. This idea was the leitmotiv of a zonal conference-seminar held in Brest 5-6 April.

Comrades Ye.K. Ligachev and O.D. Baklanov participated in its work.

Secretaries of union republic Communist Party central committees and party oblast committees [obkoms], deputy chairmen of union republic councils of ministers, chairmen of oblast soviets and union republic and oblast agro-industrial committees and trade union councils, first secretaries of union republic Lenin Communist Youth League central committees and obkoms, chairmen of republic and oblast unions of consumer trade cooperatives in the Ukraine, Belorussia, Lithuania, Moldavia, Latvia, Estonia, and Kaliningrad Oblast, and representatives of central ministries and departments participated in the seminar.

The seminar participants discussed the tasks of party, soviet, and economic organs in expanding collaboration between industrial and agricultural enterprises and developing family farms and collective horticulture and truck farming in light of the CPSU Central Committee March (1989) plenum decisions.

Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report at the conference-seminar. The Central Committee March plenum, he said, elaborated a modern agrarian policy in keeping with society's needs for a stable food supply for the population, for the socioeconomic development of the city and the countryside, and for the strengthening of the alliance between the working class, the peasantry, and the intelligentsia. The ideas and decisions of the Central Committee plenum aroused profound interest within our society and elicited a broad response abroad.

Last year, before the CPSU Central Committee March plenum, problems of improving production relations on kolkhozes and sovkhozes and the social reorganization of the countryside were examined at the All-Union Conference in Orel Oblast. The Central Committee has now adopted a decision, in light of the March plenum

guidelines, to discuss at seminar-conferences in territorial zones issues connected with expanding collaboration between industrial enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhozes and developing family farms and collective horticulture and truck farming. This is an important reserve in the food supply for the country's population—quite a quick reserve at that.

The recent analogous seminar-conference held in Omsk Oblast made it possible to feel more avidly and be convinced to a still greater degree how much collaboration between urban and rural enterprises and well-run family farms mean, given the appropriate attitude and real support. In other words, what a great force economic enterprise and peasant initiative are.

Examining in detail industry's experience of involvement in developing agriculture and strengthening its material foundation, the main speaker cited the following figures: There are now almost 22,000 rural farms at enterprises in the country. They have at their disposal 5 million hectares of agricultural land, including 2 million hectares of arable land. These farms should not be treated as subsidiary plots but as enterprises' agrarian shops with full rights. In just the same way rural rayon committees and rayon soviet executive committees must be closer to these farms' party organizations and labor collectives and consider them their own, not other people's. This is of fundamental significance.

There is another way to create agrarian shops—industrial enterprises can take over [vzyat na balans] barely profitable and loss-making farms. The CPSU Central Committee plenum confirmed the expediency in individual cases of transferring such farms to industrial enterprises.

Finally, the following point. Various forms of collaboration between industrial enterprises and kolkhozes and sovkhozes in the production of agricultural products have recently been spreading. In Odessa, for example, a portside plant concluded a long-term agreement with the Shchors Kolkhoz to construct production and social projects using its own resources and means. Last year the plant assimilated capital investments worth R500,000 and constructed a school, a machine yard, and a fertilizer storehouse. This year it is modernizing a kindergarten, constructing a shop to produce fruit and berry juice, and providing livestock units with services and amenities. In accordance with a contract, this year the kolkhoz is selling the plant collective 20 tonnes of meat and 100 tonnes of milk at contract prices and vegetables and cucurbits as the plant workers need them.

This kind of collaboration is becoming widespread in Belgorod, Dnepropetrovsk, Donetsk, and Minsk Oblasts. For 3 years industrial enterprises and scientific establishments in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast decided to invest more than R400 million in developing the countryside. Here 32 industrial-agrarian associations are operating, and more than 100 direct contracts have been concluded between plant collectives and kolkhozes and sovkhozes.

The conclusion is clear: In all republics and oblasts it is important to actively develop on a mutually advantageous basis cooperation between the industrial and agrarian sectors to improve the food supply to the population.

In our country, the report stated, family farms produce almost one-fourth of the total volume of agricultural output. More than 50 million families raise livestock and poultry and grow potatoes, fruits, and vegetables under domestic conditions. Close collaboration between family farms and kolkhozes and sovkhozes ensures the fullest combination of citizens' personal interests with the public interest. The CPSU Central Committee March plenum deemed it necessary to reinstate the full rights of citizens' private plots as an equal form of management and to lift all restrictions on their development.

Party, soviet, and economic organs in Brest, Chernigov, Zhitomir, and Ivano-Frankovsk oblasts and also in individual rayons of the Estonian and Latvian union republics are doing businesslike, committed work on developing domestic farms. Work with private plots in Ternopol Oblast merits attention. There there is an average of 126 head of cattle, including 58 cows, and 92 hogs per 100 rural yards. Last year private plots produced 76 kg of meat in live weight per oblast inhabitant.

But it is not like this everywhere. Over the past 3 years, for example, there has been a noticeable drop in milk production on private homesteads in Kharkov and Mogilev Oblasts and the Estonian and Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republics [SSR]. Little attention is devoted to developing family farms in the Moldavian SSR, where one-half of rural yards have no livestock. Meanwhile there has been a drop in production of milk and also potatoes, fruits, and berries in the republic.

It is important to fully provide rural homesteads and domestic livestock with feed and young pigs and birds. And of course, as people themselves are asking, hayfields and pastures should be assigned for long, extended periods. No one must be indifferent to the strains of plants growing on subsidiary plots or to the breed and productivity of animals on private homesteads. This aspect of the matter is plainly underestimated, and it is no coincidence that, according to data of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, the average milk yield per cow on family farms last year was 2,171 kg, but in the public sector almost 2,800 kg.

The issue of mechanizing work under domestic conditions has been placed on the agenda in the country as never before. People are asking for minitractors, power units [motobloki], and other small-size equipment. They have the money and would gladly buy them. Lessees also need such equipment.

However, there are absolutely not enough small-scale mechanization facilities. Ye.K. Ligachev analyzed these matters critically. This year it is planned to produce 1,300 minitractors and 73,000 power units, but millions are needed, and millions more. Production of power units is growing only slowly at the Minsk Tractor Plant. The Rezekne plant in Latvia has reduced deliveries of individual milking units to villages. Enterprises of the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry and the Ministry of the Aviation Industry failed to ensure last year's planned production of means of small-scale mechanization and implements for peasant homesteads.

The task consists in equipping family farms with the necessary equipment as quickly as possible. We cannot permit the spade and pitchfork to continue dominating such an important sector of the agrarian economy, that is, it cannot be left on the sidelines of scientific and technical progress. This depends primarily on the ministries of automotive and agricultural machine building, the defense sectors, and the electrical equipment industry.

The report pointed out that work on developing collective horticulture and truck farming has been stepped up in the country, and the number of garden plots has increased 70 percent in 3 years. However, citizens continue to send letters in which they report that they are experiencing difficulties in obtaining plots of land. In the provinces it is necessary to remove all obstacles to allocating plots of land to working people for family farms, gardens, and truck gardens, give all possible assistance in creating and developing them, and organize purchases of the products grown right on the spot.

The report devoted great attention to the tasks of housing construction in the countryside. When there is a good house or apartment, then, naturally, a family farm develops more strongly. During the previous 3 years the average annual commissioning of housing in rural localities in the regions represented at the conference increased 24 percent, but not identically everywhere. Whereas 482 square meters of housing per 1,000 inhabitants was handed over in Vitebsk Oblast, there was just 215 square meters in Vinnitsa Oblast, for example. Fewer apartments are still being constructed per 1,000 inhabitants in the countryside in many oblasts than in the city.

If we had a ramified system of purchases of surplus products from the population today, family farms and collective horticulture and truck gardening would undoubtedly develop more vigorously, on a greater scale. The process of the revival of consumer societies is now taking place, and the role of shareholders is being enhanced. It is necessary to create comprehensive procurement and processing enterprises in all the centers of large kolkhozes and sovkhozes. What is needed here is close cooperation between the public, private production, and cooperatives, that is, between kolkhozes and sovkhozes, family farms, and consumer societies.

A modern food industry is being created in the country, and enterprises and organizations of the defense complex are involved in this. At the same time every republic and oblast must make fuller use of their potential in this matter and show greater initiative in organizing production of equipment.

What is most important, the CPSU Central Committee secretary said in conclusion, is that there should be a system of organizing and managing the development of the rural plots of citizens and enterprises in every rayon, oblast, and republic and that the owners of plots and enterprises' agrarian shops should feel their direct involvement in the great state cause of resolving the food problem.

The CPSU Central Committee March plenum adopted very important decisions. Strenuous work for the entire people lies ahead. It is important to waste no time. [passage omitted]

The plenary session held at the end of the conference-seminar was addressed by O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. He analyzed the work of defense complex enterprises, which have been instructed to retool the processing sectors of the agro-industrial complex and upgrade the equipment used in agricultural production. Analysis of the equipment produced for industry's food sectors, he said, shows that the technical standard of a considerable amount of this equipment is poor. Naturally, this has a major influence on output quality and machine productivity. By 1995 it is planned to set up and organize series production of new equipment, 90 percent of which should be equal to world standards. In short, the defense complex has been set major tasks and there is every reason to count on radical improvements in their resolution.

Unfortunately, the results of work over the past year cannot be considered satisfactory. The existing lags in equipment production are being eliminated only slowly and the plan for the itemized product list is not being fulfilled. For the defense complex this attitude to work can in no way be justified. Every measure should be taken in 1989 to rectify the situation. The task has been set in 1989-1990 of producing many millions of rubles' worth of equipment over and above the 5-Year Plan targets—that is why this year we must not only eliminate lags but also make progress. And this must be done without in any way affecting the country's defense interests.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee emphasized the attention to the creation and production of small-scale mechanized systems, and directed the leaders

of ministries—above all, the defense complex—to the need to make a sharp turnaround and drastically improve the technical equipment available to rural working people.

These problems were analyzed by USSR Ministers O.G. Anfimov, L.B. Vasilyev, I.V. Koksanov, N.A. Pugin, and Ye.I. Sizenko. They also talked about enterprises' participation in manufacturing orders for the countryside and touched on existing problems hindering the fulfillment of deliveries on time.

Opinions were also exchanged by I.G. Grintsov, secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee; B.I. Poshkus, director of the Lithuanian SSR Economics and Organization of Agricultural Production Scientific Research Institute; and A.P. Bril, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee.

The results of the work were summed up by Ye.K. Ligachev.

Taking part in the conference-seminar were I.I. Skiba, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agrarian Department, and leading workers from the USSR State Planning Committee, the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the USSR People's Control Committee, the Central Union of Consumer Societies, and the All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Leaque Central Committee.

Ligachev, Baklanov Visit Farms

LD0604214789 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 6 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Excerpts] Matters relating to the expansion of coordination between the enterprises of industry and agriculture, and to the development of family holdings, collective horticulture, and market gardening, were discussed at a zonal conference and seminar in the Belorussian city of Brest. Here is our correspondent Ye. Sinitsyn.

[Sinitsyn] These Ikarus buses depart with the participants at the seminar along three routes—collective farms, state farms, greenhouse combines, and the holdings of the district consumer unions. And everywhere there is a broad exchange of opinions on matters relating to the main theme. Expansion and development depends primarily on these people—the leaders of party, local soviet, trade union, and All-Union Leninist Communist Youth Leaque [Komsomol] organizations. They are the ones who will later be held responsible. But for now one can say that lessons are underway. [video shows conference delegates, including Ligachev, amid buildings in a rural setting]

What, for example, can one learn from the Pogrannichnik collective farm? [video shows Ligachev and Baklanov among the platform group as a speaker addresses the delegates in a lecture room] The collective farm allocates pastureland and mowing machines to its workers to allow them to feed the livestock on their own farmsteads. As a result, the procurement of meat from each rural family has increased by 21 kg. Milk production has increased by nearly 10 percent.

The guests acquainted themselves at the 27th party congress collective farm and combine with the experience of coordinating the farms resources in the oblast in order to create a construction materials enterprise. [video shows the farm and shows the delegates examining the construction materials. Ligachev picks up a red brick and examines it]

Vladimir Leontevich Bedulya, the famous farm chairman, works at the Soviet Belorussia collective farm. [video shows latter greeting Ligachev with a loaf of bread] There was a meeting at the house of Culture. The conversation about family holdings was continued. [passage omitted]

[Sinitsyn] Yegor Kuzmich Ligachev and Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov visited the museum of bread grain, the first and still the only such museum in the country.

The closing of the conference-cum-seminar also took place today. Oleg Dmitriyevich Baklanov spoke of the tasks of the country's defense industry, which has taken upon itself to assist agriculture. [video shows delegates back in the main conference hall being addressed by Baklanov]

The speakers mentioned once more the positive multiformity of ways of managing farms.

[Begin Ligachev recording] I want to stress once again that in Orel Oblast we examined, under the leadership of Mikhail Sergeyevich, matters related to an improvement of collective state farms, economic relations, and also the social development of the countryside. Let no impression be formed that Ligachev and others have now got carried away, you understand, with matters pertaining to the private sector, and have abandoned collective farms. No! I have said, and I will say it once more, that collective state farms are the main form of management, which, by and large, make up the agricultural resources of the country. [end recording]

Scientific

Activities of Crew on 'Mir' Complex Outlined

Maintenance Work To Be Done

LD0604101489 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 6 Apr 89

[Text] A report from the flight control center: The cosmonauts Aleksandr Vokov, Sergey Krikalev, and Valeriy Polyakov will be engaged for the most part today in planned preventive work with the station's equipment

and onboard systems. It is intended in particular to replace certain units and assemblies whose guarantee period is expiring. According to the crew's reports and telemetric data everything on board is in order. The cosmonauts' health is good, and they are feeling well.

Experiments Conducted

LD0704164889 Moscow TASS in English 1334 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—TASS Correspondent reports from the flight Control Centre:

Aleksandr Volkov, Sergey Krikalev and Valeriy Polyakov continue work aboard the orbital complex Mir.

The programme of the crew's work this week involved geophysical and technical experiments and also medico-biological research. They also carried out maintenance work on separate systems and equipment of the complex.

With the aid of the apparatus circea, which was developed by French specialists, the cosmonauts performed a series of experiments to assess the dynamics of space radiation level in near-terrestrial space depending on solar activity.

Today the crew will have another session of photographic scanning of the earth's surface, check the complex's radioengineering communication systems with the flight control centre via ther relay satellite. During the day they are to pump water from the tanks of Progress-41 freighter into the tanks of the station.

The cosmonauts feel well. On Saturday and Sunday they will have rest.

Military

Events Relating to Air Defense Troops Day

Yazov Marks Air Defense Troops Day

LD0704154389 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] A solemn meeting of representatives of the capital's public and servicemen of the Moscow Garrison, devoted to Air Defense Troops Day [Sunday, 9 April] was held today in Moscow. In the presidium were Army General Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of defense, representatives of party, local soviet and public organizations, military commanders, and veterans of the USSR Armed Forces.

Air Defense Deputy Interviewed

LD0904195289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1115 GMT 9 Apr 89

[Interview with Colonel-General Vladimir Vasiliyevich Litvinov, first deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense Forces, by Lev Bykovskikh on the occasion of Air Defense Troops Day—date and place not given; recorded]

[Bykovskikh] Air Defense Troops Day was established by a decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium on 20 February 1975, and has been marked annually on the second Sunday of April. The history of the emergence of the troops begins in the October days of 1917, when, on the personal command of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the workers of the Putilov works built the first armored flatcars with antiaircraft cannon. Today, the Air Defense troops are equipped with modern antiaircraft missile complexes, supersonic all-weather fighter-interceptors, long distance radar detector stations, automated control systems, and computers. The Air Defense troops are an arm of the USSR's Armed Forces on constant combat alert. We visited the command post of one of the military units of the air defenses, which protects the air borders of Moscow and oblast. Here we met Colonel-General Vladimir Vasiliyevich Litvinov, first deputy commander in chief of Air Defense Forces. [Litvinov shown seated at desk with radar sets. Interview is intercut with occasional shots of troops at radar sets, one brief clip of fighters firing missiles at airborne target and archive film of World War II towards end of interview]

[Litvinov] Today is a holiday in the Air Defense Forces. For all who have served in the Air Defense Forces, have worked together with the Air Defense Forces, or who have built this equipment, this is a holiday of course. On this day, I would like to say that we have never wished to dim the hopes of Soviet working people, and I think that we shall worthily carry out the task that is laid upon us. At the same time, I would like to respond to certain comrades who express at times, both in the written press and on radio and television, unfounded complaints, sometimes even with insults against the troops of the Air Defense Force. We do not always manage to give them the response they merit. We are grateful to the Soviet people for the fact that this holiday is celebrated, in a kind and good way, and at the same time we are self-critical. We perceive correctly all these recommendations, requirements, and hopes that the Air Defense Forces will enhance their combat readiness and be ready to carry out the combat tasks entrusted to them.

[Bykovskikh] We used to say that the Army was a kind of closed zone, but the Air Defense Forces were such a closed zone that you would never get over the seven fences surrounding it.

[Litvinov] You know, especially lately, there has been no question of this, because the minister of defense and the head of the Main Political Directorate have given commands to meet with journalists, to open up fully to them everything that there is, show them everything that there is, so that the journalists will be able to see for themeselves and draw conclusions, from the outside, so to speak. Journalists have recently visited an airborne troop unit, an antiaircraft missile regiment armed with new technology, and command posts.

[Bykkovskikh] Journalists from all the central papers, that is?

[Litvinov] All the central papers. They brought a lot of interesting material away with them, and at the same time, we drew a lot of interesting material from the meetings, too, because we prepared for these meetings, we thought through the questions, we thought through the replies, but everything went quite differently from what we expected. It was all simpler, closer to life, more frank, because the issues that came up were most varied, from everyday conditions and the prospects of a service career, to the maximum utilization of the expensive complex, and reliable equipment which are provided for the troops by the people. Looking from the point of view of technology, the technology in the aviation units of the Air Defense Forces, in the antiaircraft missile troops, the radiotechnical troops, the technology of communications, the automatic control systems, the remote control mechanics, the electronics, we have a variety, but the greater part of it is up to world standards. We always base our preparations on the requirements that the enemy might demand of us, that is we study the enemy and his capabilities, his operational tactics, and we make our preparations on this basis. We know that at the moment, there is a lot of propaganda about new models of weaponry of the supposed enemy, its great capabilities are being demonstrated and propagandized, you could say, its high speed, there is talk of targets being hypersonic, targets built under the Stealth program, invisible, and so on, talk that these will be difficult to detect. And because they are difficult to detect, there will be little time to process the work and it will be difficult to fight against them. But we are adopting every measure to make full use of the combat capabilities of the equipment that we have.

[Bykovskikh] Can you tell me if you know of any enemy systems which you could not detect and hit?

[Litvinov] I don't know of any enemy systems that we could not detect and hit. We have such capabilities—both to detect and destroy.

[Bykovskikh] On the one hand, there is up-to-date equipment and a high level of technical progress, and on the other there are people. What are their conditions of service and everyday life? To what extent does the one correspond with the other?

[Litvinov] It is difficult to create ideal conditions or good, normal conditions for people, as required, everywhere equally. These matters are better placed and resolved in areas of the central Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] and the union republics. But in outlying garrisons and at distant locations, where individual subunits are stationed, it is difficult to resolve this problem, particularly in the radar troops on islands, peninsulas, and highland areas. This is a difficult problem. But it is planned to solve this problem, and starting with this year, a very great deal has already been done.

[Bykovskikh] As far as the restructuring in the Armed Forces is concerned, we know that to some extent, this restructuring started in the Air Defense troops, after that event which no doubt many are familiar with. But what critical conclusions can be drawn from that lesson?

[Litvinov] The incident in which a light aircraft overflew the territory of our country the year before last was for us a harsh but instructive lesson. And, in the course of the last 1 and ½ - 2 years, everything that we have been doing to improve the country's air defenses has been determined by the demands arising from that incident for the future, too, with due consideration being given to even more sophisticated methods that can be employed to violate the state border and the subsequent performance of the tasks that will be dictated by such a violator. Much attention has been devoted to the further improvement of what can be called organizational matters, the further improvement of the technical parameters of combat equipment and armaments. If you take, specifically, the cutting short of flights of similar targets, a large number of exercises are being conducted with airmen to ensure that low-altitude, low-speed targets flying with the ground as background are rapidly detected, that the information is conveyed to the control points, and that combat control officers take precise aim at the target in order to cut short the flight. Under existing provisions, the use of combat weapons against transport aircraft and light planes is not recommended.

[Bykovskikh] So the law on the protection of the air frontiers is now tougher, and provides for other possibilities and facilities to be applied. Is that not so?

[Litvinov] Article 36 of the USSR Constitution states that if a plane that violates the state border fails to obey commands and continues its flight, the flight must be cut short inside the territory of the country. And all tasks, as before, and particularly now, are geared to ensuring that the requirements laid down by the constitution are met.

[Bykovskikh] Have you been first deputy commander in chief of the Air Defense troops for long?

[Litvinov] I was appointed to this post a year and a half ago.

[Bykovskikh] What academy did you attend?

[Litvinov] I graduated from the Dnepropetrovsk radar and artillery college in 1955.

[Bykovskikh] How old are you, if you'll excuse my asking?

[Litvinov] I'm 52—I'll be 53 shortly.

[Bykhovskiy] We've got used to seeing more elderly people in such ranks as colonel-general. How do you think your military career has turned out?

[Litvinov] I think it has turned out well.

[Bykovskiy] In your career, you must have been nurtured on the traditions that the Air Defense troops have been famed for throughout the years?

[Litvinov] Traditions must always be preserved and added to, and we must fight for the good traditions that exist in the Air Defense troops. We must not only take pride in them, but we must also increase them. The Air Defense troops were set up back in the first days after the establishment of the Soviet Red Army, the Soviet Army. Subsequently a very large number of difficult missions had to be accomplished. We know that during the Great Fatherland War, more than 7,000 fascist aircraft were shot down by the Air Defense troops. More than 1,000 tanks, up to 1,500 guns and mortars, and much pesonnel and equipment of the enemy were destroyed by the men of the Air Defense troops. This courage, heroism, and dedication to the job at hand have of course come to serve as the basis for educating officers, warrant officers, sergeants, and soldiers in the combat traditions of the Air Defense troops. We see this as the principal priming device in our work. This is also confirmed during the everyday work in peacetime today. We know well, for instance, that in fulfilling his internationalist duty, Lieutenant-Colonel Levchenko repeated the fiery ramming maneuver performed by (Nikolay Rastylo). On the southern borders, Captain (Yeliseyev), hero of the Soviet Union, was the first in the history of jet aircraft to halt the flight of an aircraft that had violated the state border by ramming it.

In everyday life, too, we have very many examples of courage, heroism, and valor being manifested by men of the Air Defense troops. This must not be forgotten. It is our obligation to build on it.

[Bykovskikh] This program is going out at a time when many high school students are wondering how to get into a military academy. Some will go to Air Defense colleges. Where are these colleges to be found, and what are the entrance requirements?

[Litvinov] To those young people who are picking the profession of service in the Air Defense troops, I would first of all like to ask them to think very seriously about choosing this profession, because service in the Air Defense troops is difficult. We don't want people saying later, after graduation from higher educational establishments, that they have picked the wrong profession. But once someone has chosen this profession, it is better, it is preferable, to enter a college according to calling. You can train at a military radar engineering academy; in higher engineering colleges; at the Minsk, Kiev, and Pushkinskiy Air Defense Troops Radio Electronics Colleges; in the Far East and Siberia at the Krasnoyarsk Radar College; antiaircraft missile troops at Ordzhonikidze, Yaroslavl, and Gorkiy; and pilots at Armavir and Stavropol. These details have been published in the press. We shall be glad to welcome those who choose a profession as officer in the Air Defense troops.

Today, on Air Defense Troops Day, permit me to extend my greetings on this holiday to veterans of the Armed Forces, veterans of the Air Defense troops, generals, officers, warrant officers, sergeants, soldiers, servicemen's families, and the engineers and technicians who have developed complex equipment for the Air Defense troops, and to thank the Soviet people for the trust they have vested in us and for the fact that on this holiday, they trust us to perform the mission given to us. We shall be equal to this trust.

Antiaircraft Complex Visited

LD0904173189 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 9 Apr 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast, from the military review presented by military observer Valeriy Voloshin]

[Text] [Voloshin, in studio] Today is Air Defense Troops Day. We present a report about those who are celebrating their professional holiday.

[Begin recording] [Correspondent V. Bargnov] Today, for the first time we have the opportunity of showing this antiaircraft missile complex on television, even though its is one of the latest models of Air Defense weapons. [Video shows missile moving on an eight-wheeled transporter; missile has long cylindrical body with a darker warhead, four main deltoid fins, and four trapezoid tail surfaces indexed in line with the main fins; there are apparently antiflutter weights on the fins. The tail section of the main body of the missile bears four strap-on boosters near the tail section, each with individual trapezoid control surfaces. Shot of rear view of missile, presumbably being erected. Officer guiding missile transporter toward shelter. Scene enacted in snowy conditions]

The complex encompasses the most modern achievements of scientific and technical thought. Operating automatically, under any weather conditions, it is capable of hitting various air targets. Complicated and clever technology requires an excellent team, strenous exercises, and a high level of training. The teams operate accurately in coordinations while preparing the missile for a training launch. [video shows soldier connecting cable to launcher, automatic device swinging up beneath

missile; missile moving along rails; men in protective clothing running to climb metal ladder under shelter as indistinct commands ring out; team shown running at each signal to detach cable from transporter and attach it to launcher, which has been aligned behind transporter]

Recalling the lessons of the past whereby the inviolability of the air frontiers of our motherland depends upon constant vigilance and combat readiness, and upon the personal responsibility of every specialist, missile troops are today seeking new ways of raising the quality of their training.

[Lieutenant Colonel V.I. Latynin, interviewed in front of missile complex while exercise continues behind him] We are striving to further improve combat training first and foremost by improving our methods, and in this academic year to transfer to a comprehensive method of training the personnel, the teams. I may say for comparison: Whereas in the past we trained soldiers in individual training subjects, so that they trained directly using the equipment only at the final stage, nowadays they work on the equipment in the very first days of their training. Here now is Sgt (Gazalov's) team. The servicemen in the team are from the last service call-up. In a short time, just 3 months, they have mastered a speciality; they have passed into the third class; they are permitted to do operational duty independently; and they overfulfil their norms for operational work by 10-15 percent. [video shows missile being carried off on transporter] [end recording]

Moscow Military District To Hold Exercises

LD0704164289 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 7 Apr 89

[Text] Moscow April 7 TASS—It was officially announced here that the Moscow Military District will hold a troop exercise on Soviet territory in the area of Vyazniki, Yuzha, Gorodets and Dzerzhinsk (the central European territory of the USSR) with the objective of upgrading the field training standard of the troops.

The exercise will involve formations and units of the land and air forces, totalling 17,200 people.

In accordance with the Stockholm conference document, the USSR Government has invited to the exercise observers from nations taking part in the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE).